

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE offence of the Cross does not seem to be felt now half so much as the offence of the First Beatitude. Yet it is now, more than ever in the world's history, that that first beatitude ought to be accepted. For it is the beatitude of democracy.

---

How does it read in the version of St. Luke? Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God.' And St. Luke's is usually regarded as the original form of the saying. It is so regarded by the latest commentator on it, an anonymous writer in *The Times* for June 29.

---

St. Matthew's version is an interpretation. It is an interpretation for Gentiles. So says this anonymous writer. 'Blessed are the poor,' the Gentiles could not understand, and so St. Matthew gave it the interpretation, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.'

---

Now, if that is so, it is the interpretation that contains the modern offence. It is not the original beatitude. Interpreting it for the Gentiles, St. Matthew has made it a hard saying, and that just for the Gentiles in whose interest he gave it the interpretation. For it may be said that the only thing in Christianity which makes it unattractive in the eyes of young men to-day is this: it is the religion of poor-spiritedness. This is the conception of Christianity that is caricatured in fiction.

It is a conception that needs no caricature. It is immediately and instinctively rejected as an offence.

---

Why do we not pass by St. Matthew's interpretation then, and take the original as it is in St. Luke? Because we discover that there is no difference. The poor of St. Luke are the poor, of that there is little doubt. But they are not blessed because they are poor. The poor are blessed when they are poor in spirit.

---

"The poor," says the writer in *The Times*, 'was a recognised term among the Jews for those who had dedicated themselves to the service of God. For the sake of that service they divested themselves of all pride of place and possessions and power, and refusing to be distracted either by the riches or the pleasures of life gave themselves entirely to the will of God in the humble acknowledgement of His righteousness and mercy. They were, for the most part, literally poor in this world's goods, and even when they possessed its riches they held them cheaply, accounting the prizes of this world to be but tinsel, seen to be mere glitter in the pure light of the Divine Presence. They were the poor, but they possessed God, and having Him they had that which all the world's riches could not secure for men. They had attained blessedness.'



Now it is really this that makes the offence of the first beatitude. And this is not the offence of the first beatitude only. It is the offence of Christianity. It is the offence of the Cross. The 'Gentile' knows very well that the true follower of Christ is no 'poor-spirited creature.' He knows that on all occasions he is as ready to quit himself like a man as any one. It is the veriest pretence that it is the first beatitude that keeps our modern manhood away from Christ. What keeps them away is the demand of Christ for the surrender of the will with the passions and lusts thereof.

---

And yet every thinking man knows that only in the surrender of the will to a high and righteous ideal, such as Christ is, can happiness be found. Some of our modern translators begin every one of the beatitudes with the word 'Happy' rather than the word 'Blessed.' And they are not wrong. For blessedness is just happiness gained. 'The blessed are the happy, with a happiness which this world cannot confer on its most favoured children, and for which its most precious gifts can offer no compensation.'

---

'It is not true that happiness consists in freedom from anxiety, for, as Froude declared, freedom from care can be assured by a hard heart and a good digestion. Blessedness is not attained by ignoring the evil in human society, nor by minimizing its awful subtlety and power. Nor is it attained by withdrawing from the world, and refusing to take the risks of life with its turmoil and its dangers. It is not won by our possessions, nor by our powers of mind, nor even by our own skillful use of fortune. Not until we have given up our trust in these and become poor can we secure happiness, for this springs only from complete reliance on One whose will is known to be the will to love infinitely.'

---

Stevenson made this discovery, though he also very nearly missed it. What he discovered was the necessity of a high and moral ideal in life if

happiness was to be had. 'It was one of the great services that Robert Louis Stevenson rendered to his generation that he so attractively insisted on the ethical value of happiness. One of his friends declared that it touched every part of his experience, from physical pleasures up through the delights of intellectual and moral life to the most exalted spiritual joys; and its proclamation is a distinguishing feature of his life's work. Happiness, he proclaimed, was the spring of all worthy effort. The highest and purest and most abiding happiness man can experience is the recognition of an ideal which he has made his own, whose reality he has tested in experience, and to which he has learned to devote himself with complete conviction.'

---

Such a man is blessed because his is the Kingdom of Heaven. For the Kingdom of Heaven is such an ideal. 'It satisfies the affections, for it is no mere machinery of government, but a company of men and women in whom God lives, and who can respond to affection and sacrifice, and repay them a hundredfold. It matches the claims of the intellect, for it has many and varied problems which call for the study of the devout mind. It employs all the energies in the prosecution of tasks which ever challenge the devotion of the servants of God and humanity.'

---

Blessed are ye poor—if ye are poor in spirit. It is not poor-spiritedness; it is true manliness. It is not weakness; it is the fullest, firmest strength. Yet is it out of a sense of humility that the manliness arises; it is out of a sense of weakness that the strength is born. Given the sense of weakness and the realization of a great need, and men will gladly accept that poverty, that happy poverty, which not only leads them to seek the strength that comes from above, but 'enables them to find the fullest happiness in self-effacing service for the Kingdom of Heaven. Thus they may go forth as its citizens, renouncing their own strength but relying on the power of God, content to live and die in its service, and knowing that though the way



may be long it will never be lonely, for in that Kingdom there is fellowship with God and His servants, with work and affection for all. "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

---

There is one fact which tells more against belief in the miracles of the New Testament than any other. It is the fact that miracles do not take place now. And it is an undeniable fact.

---

It is true that since the war began there has been not a little talk about the miraculous interference of God, either in certain outstanding events of it, such as the Battle of the Marne, or else in the experience of some prominent participators in it, such as that great young airman, Captain Albert Ball. But it never passed beyond talk. It is the conviction of this person and the next who is already a believer in modern miracles, or it is the interpretation of a man's marvellous escapes from danger, an interpretation preferred by Captain Ball himself to the rough-and-ready theory of good luck. It never alters the fact that the average man, educated or uneducated, rejects the miracles of the New Testament because miracles *do not occur*.

---

And so difficult is it now to meet that objection that the most scholarly writing on the New Testament, even the writing of professional theologians, especially of the younger men, has as its first aim and end to show that Christ and the benefits of the New Covenant may be received in all their power for life and godliness without the necessity of accepting a single New Testament miracle. With some recent writers it is probable that no conscious purpose of denying the miracles is ever present. With others it is evidently the one conscious and deliberate purpose. But in either case the idea is that, as soon as it is perceived that Christianity can get along without miracles, the miracles of the New Testament will cease to be regarded. Then there will be nothing to prevent

scientific men from believing in Christ and Him crucified as the Saviour of their souls.

---

It is a profound mistake. From the beginning until now an unmiraculous Christianity has had no influence in the world. Men have always asked for a saviour; it has never been any use to offer them a saint. They may not have been concerned for the retention of this miracle or that. They may have been willing to surrender the Descent into Hades on grounds of interpretation, or the Virgin Birth on grounds of attestation; or even the Raising of Lazarus from the Dead on grounds of internal evidence. But they have never called that Christianity which had no room for the actual miracles of the Incarnation and the Resurrection.

---

Let us however begin with the statement that miracles do not occur. And let us accept it. Professor WARFIELD accepts it. He has one word for all the miracles that have ever been wrought since the days of the Apostles. They are counterfeit. Professor WARFIELD of the Princeton Theological Seminary was invited to deliver a course of lectures at the Columbia Theological Seminary, South Carolina. He delivered them, and now publishes them with this title: *Counterfeit Miracles* (Scribner; \$2 net). For his purpose has been to prove not only that the miracles claimed by the Roman Church, the Church of the Irvingites, the advocates of Faith Healing and Mind Cure, are not true miracles, but also that they could not be true miracles since by their nature all miracles had to cease on the death of the original Twelve Apostles.

---

That is not the common belief. The common belief, even of those who believe that miracles never occur now, is that they ceased gradually in the early Church, just because the necessity for them came to a gradual end. Ask almost any theologian you meet, ask even the accomplished student of early Church history, and he is pretty certain to tell you that the power to work miracles lasted on to the end of the third



century or thereby. Professor WARFIELD absolutely denies it. Instead of gradually dying out, the power to work miracles ceased at once with the life of the Apostles, and for some time no claim to the working of miracles was made by the Church. 'There is little or no evidence at all for miracle-working during the first fifty years of the post-Apostolic Church; it is slight and unimportant for the next fifty years; it grows more abundant during the next century (the third); and it becomes abundant and precise only in the fourth century, to increase still further in the fifth and beyond.'

Professor WARFIELD believes that the power to work miracles was never recovered by the Church. It was falsely claimed. The miracles which were wrought after the Apostolic age were counterfeit miracles. Miracles do not occur. They never have occurred since the end of the first century. He starts with that.

Here then is the question which we have to answer: Why were there miracles in our Lord's life, and in the lives of His Apostles? Now let it never be forgotten that it is not the impossibility of miracles that troubles the unbeliever. No man of understanding holds that miracles are impossible. As long ago as the polemical days of Professor Huxley it was freely admitted that science had nothing to say against the possibility of a miracle. Science is more ready to admit it now. Miracles do not occur—that is the fact which stands in the way. And what we have to do is to show that there is a good reason why miracles which do not occur now should have occurred then.

It will not do to say that they were necessary in order to arrest people's attention. They did not arrest the attention. They were too common to arrest the attention. 'If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?' For their 'children' were quite accustomed to cast out devils. No doubt there were miracles and

miracles. Just as Moses could beat the magicians of Egypt at their own trade, so Jesus could astonish the simple Galileans with the wonder of the wind and the sea obeying Him. But there are few things more certain in the Gospels than the fact that Jesus did not work miracles in order to arrest the attention.

Nor will it do to say that the miracles were wrought in order to prove the truth of the teaching. The proof of the teaching was the practice of it: 'If any man will do the will of God, he shall know of the doctrine.' How can one thing be proved by means of another thing that is extraneous to it? Truth is of the mind; miracle is of the body. When Jesus said to the man sick of the palsy, 'Rise up and walk,' He did not do so in order to prove to the man the truth of the forgiveness of sins. He did it in order to make the man every whit whole. The Jews taunted Jesus on the Cross: 'Come down, and we will believe thee.' Would they have believed Him? They would not have believed though one of themselves had returned from the dead.

And yet miracles have a close relation to teaching. They appear, says Professor WARFIELD, when God has some new revelation to make. They do not attest the truth of the revelation. But they are a witness to the authority of him who makes it.

How does revelation come? It comes through personality. The truth revealed is not detachable from the person revealing it. For revelation is by the Spirit of God. It is the Spirit of God in possession of some personal life, and through the words and acts of that life making known the mind of God.

Now when the Spirit of God takes possession of a human being, His presence makes itself known in all his activities. The foremost result is the new truth spoken. That is the object of the entrance. But along with the truth spoken there is the deed done. The deed does not witness to



the truth, it accompanies it. Both deed and truth are the signs of the indwelling Spirit. Nicodemus was not wrong when he said, 'We know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.' The miracles were not the evidence for the teaching, they were the credentials of the teacher. The miracles wrought and the doctrine taught were together the sign that God was with Jesus.

When God's time has come to make a new revelation to the world He finds His instrument or instruments. He makes His revelation first to these instruments themselves. He makes it by giving them the gift of the Spirit, or, in other words, by coming to them and making His abode with them. That is the revelation. No other operation—act, word, or thought—is necessary. The simple but exceptional presence is enough. He does not destroy the man's personality. He enlightens it. He enlarges it. He vitalizes it. The man in whom the Spirit of God dwells lives in the power of that Spirit; and it is a matter of indifference whether the power is seen in new word or unaccustomed deed. In either case it is simply a manifestation of the Spirit. It is the Spirit of God manifesting itself according to its own nature. The man is a teacher come from God because he does miracles; he does miracles because he is a teacher come from God.

Are there times, then, when God determines to give the world a new revelation? Everything depends upon the answer to that question. And who can doubt what the answer will be? The occasions may be few. We have at present to do with one occasion only. Who denies that in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being Governor of Judæa, the word of the Lord came into the world in a new and wholly unprecedented fashion? It came, we hold, first of all in the form of an Incarnation. God *sent* the Person in whom His Spirit might dwell, for the indwelling had to

be without measure. That was not the only reason for the special messenger. He had, we believe, to die for the Gospel before He could declare it. But at present all we have to think of is the fact of the revelation. God found, at the beginning of this era of ours, that the fulness of the time had come, and sent forth His Son to make a new revelation to the world.

He received the Spirit without measure. And without measure were the signs of its presence. Never before was the Spirit given without measure. And never before were such miracles wrought. 'What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?' I will tell you the manner of the man. He is a man in whom the Spirit of God is dwelling and acting without let or hindrance. God is in Christ revealing Himself in word and deed, just as the manner of God is. For all the fulness of God dwells in Him.

And the Spirit will remain until the revelation is made. Now Jesus did not make the whole revelation Himself. Let us say rather that He made it, but did not make it known. The special revelation we are speaking about is usually called the Gospel. And the peculiarity of the revelation called the Gospel is that it had to be made before it could be made known. Jesus made it. He left the task to His Apostles to make it known. He chose twelve men for this very end that they should receive the Gospel as soon as He had made it, and then make it known.

But they could not make it known until they received the gift of the Spirit. The Gospel was there, but they had to tarry in Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high. The power came with the Holy Spirit. As soon as they received the Spirit of God they went forth with power to make the Gospel known.

The first effect of the gift of the Spirit was personal transfiguration. Peter was Peter still,



but better. He was bolder, he was clearer-sighted, he had a better command of himself. This was one of the manifestations of the Spirit's presence. Other manifestations were activity in preaching, and faculty for working miracles. The Apostles could not work miracles as Jesus did, for they had not received the Spirit without measure as He had done. But according to the measure of their gift of the Spirit (which was no doubt according to their receptiveness) they manifested God's presence with them in the way of miracles also, that way being natural to the working of the Spirit of God.

Now if the Spirit of God is a special gift, given for the purpose of making known this wonderful new revelation which we call the Gospel, it will be expected that it will continue until the revelation is fully made. When was it fully made? Professor WARFIELD believes that it was fully made when the last of the disciples died upon whom the Apostles laid their hands.

For it is to be observed that the laying on of hands was the appointed way by which the Spirit was given. Does it seem a strange way? Perhaps there is more in it even as an act than we have been ready to understand. But there is certainly an impressive simplicity about it. And until a better way can be suggested, we may say that it was the best way that could have been adopted. In any case, it was the appointed way. Except at Pentecost, and on the occasion of the entrance of the Gentile Cornelius into the fellowship of the disciples, there is no example of the Spirit of God being given otherwise than by the laying on of hands.

And no laying on of hands conferred this power after the death of the twelve Apostles. On whomsoever *they* laid their hands, on them came the gift with its usual manifestations. But none of those who received that gift from the laying on of the Apostles' hands seems to have been able to confer it upon others. With the death of those

on whom the Apostles laid their hands, the gift of the Spirit for the revelation of the Gospel passed from the earth. The work was done. The revelation was fully made.

---

'The same yesterday, and to-day, and forever.'  
Does that mean very old or very young?

---

We say very old. 'We catch a Russian peasant, one of the class that are being held up to us as the really religious people of the world. Hepworth DIXON tells of a conversation he had with such an one: they got into conversation on the other side of convention (a point not easy to reach, least of all with peasants), and the Russian confided to him that "We shan't have God with us much longer: I've seen His picture in the church, and He is a very old man. You may depend upon it, St. Nicholas will have His place!" (St. Nicholas is the popular, rosy-cheeked bishop who boxed the ears of Arius at the Council of Nicæa, and has great honour since as the "man who did.") But what of the picture in the church? Alas! it is the Apocalyptic picture of Daniel and Enoch, and even of St. John, the one whose hair is white, not with "a hundred winters snowed upon his breast," but white with the snows of eternal years, the great Alpine God that never melts.'

---

We say God is very old. Rendel HARRIS says He is very young. For Jesus is the express image of His Person; Jesus is the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever; and Jesus is eternally youthful. In a paper contributed to *Problems of To-Morrow* (already noticed), Dr. Rendel HARRIS announces the discovery of the youthfulness of Jesus Christ, His youthfulness on earth, His youthfulness in eternity.

---

'Call this, if you like, a discovery,' he says, 'but it would hardly have been a discovery to those who were near enough to His time to remember that He began the doing and the teaching of His public ministry when He was thirty years of age, and that He ended it when He was thirty-three



years of age, or, as some of the earliest traditions say, when He was thirty-one.'

Have we realized this? Have we realized how young He was, is, and must be? 'I recall,' says Dr. Rendel HARRIS, 'an incident from my own college days, which I have told more than once, and the time is come to tell it again; how I was one day talking with an ardent spirit in my own college concerning the character and merits of Jesus, talking with a man who had, from very earnestness, discarded nominal Christianity, and who said to me of our Lord, "And He did all that before He was my age!" If I were now to say that sort of thing I should have put it more strongly: "And He did all that before He was half my age!" Think of it! It is a statement that has evangelical value. What manner of man is this that even the months and the years are subject to Him!'

The early Christians realized it. 'It may be a discovery to us, but it was not a discovery to the early Church, which affirmed in its catacomb pictures of the *Good Shepherd* a youthful form. They even exaggerated His youth, as the manner of artists is; they drew Him beardless, which can hardly have been the case; on the sarcophagi which now adorn the Lateran Museum at Rome we shall see the figure of the second Adam presenting the ears of corn, which make the heavenly bread, to the first Adam, and He will be as young as stone can make Him.'

And it was a discovery of the Evangelical Revival—an incidental discovery, Dr. Rendel HARRIS calls it. For, 'as you know, the Evangelical Revival, like every great spiritual movement, was a movement of song: it was truth set to music—a new creation with the sons of God shouting together and singing for joy. I have often deplored the songlessness of the modern Evangelical and Protestant Churches; but if they have ceased to sing it is because they have ceased to be evangelical. When the next revival comes,

it will come as a nobler, sweeter song, just as heaven itself comes to true believers. It was so in the beginning of the eighteenth century. Every one concedes that, except for one ill-phrased verse, there is hardly a more moving, a more sacramental hymn than the one that begins:

When I survey the wondrous Cross.

Not every one knows of the important change that was made in that first verse, apparently in the second edition and with the author's own revising hand. It stood once:

When I survey the wondrous Cross,  
Where the young Prince of Glory died;

and this has been altered to:

On which the Prince of Glory died.'

'The early Moravians had made a similar discovery, and had writ it large over their hymn-book. The first Moravian hymn-book, compiled for the most part by persons who were imperfectly accoutred for the writing of English prose, and certainly altogether unequipped for writing sacred song, is one of the wildest, weirdest books that I know. It is gross in conception, grotesque in expression, and seems altogether to contradict my theory of the morning songs of new spiritual movements. If the morning stars sang this way, the sons of God will certainly never be caught shouting for joy. But stay! Let us beware of rapid judgments: let us turn the pages in search of the Young Prince of Glory and see what we find.'

Dr. Rendel HARRIS finds a magnificent hymn ('magnificent in streaks,' he says) 'addressed to the members of the Moravian brotherhood who are "Ready for land, sea, marriage at command":

Ye who would rather live and fight awhile  
Than be dismissed as yet from glorious toil,  
Who from the world's bewitching lusts are fled,  
And burn t' advance the glory of your Head,  
*Before the youth divine*, come, bow the knee,  
Eldest of all the heavenly Family.'



He finds the youthfulness of Christ in other Moravian hymns. He finds it in a hymn 'addressed to what I suppose we should call the Young People's Guild (*Jünglingsvolk*):

Daily, as soon as thou getst up,  
Thou young-men's choir, let thy thoughts be,  
On our Lord Jesu's happy troop  
Of Witnesses: then say, May He,  
Jesus the single Brethren's Head,  
In these His Times us keep and lead.

And then so think, *as if thou wert*  
*Jesus the youth*, not only thou.  
In that with Him connected Heart,  
So ev'n thy last occasions do;  
So pray, so eat, so work, so ply,  
So journey, so be sick and die.

There is the young Jesus, the young saint's *alter ego*, and Double, and Indweller.'

Last of all the discovery has been made by Mr. H. G. Wells. Dr. Rendel HARRIS takes note of the fact and gives the discoverer all due credit for it. 'You can read what he says on this theme—and it is the most important part of his theme—in the pages of the book called "The Invisible King." And I see that he returns to the subject in his new book called "The Soul of a Bishop."'

What is the value of it? Much every way. It is the secret, the real secret, of keeping young. 'And if we agree to the eternal youth of Christ, and live our life in Him, the possibility of service and the vision of service is something very different from the traditional habit of good works, the sort of thing described by Mrs. Browning:

The poor club exercised her Christian gifts,  
Of knitting stockings, stitching petticoats,  
Because we are of one flesh after all  
And need one flannel (with a proper sense  
Of difference in the quality).'

It is the secret in particular of missionary service. Dr. Rendel HARRIS introduces again for a moment the Moravians, that we may see 'what their Youth Divine did for them and with them. It is well known that they are the real pioneers and forerunners of the missionary movement; that they discovered the negro, the Esquimaux, the Red Indian; that every man and woman among them was a potential missionary. If their hymns on missionary subjects are sometimes grotesque and almost comic, their experience was tragic enough for the first days of a martyr faith. In a few years over a hundred had laid down their lives. They tried to live as the natives and died fast and freely. It was magnificent, but it was not war. Still, they had found the Christian missing link and taught the other Churches their secret. It is easy to laugh at a verse like this:

Can there among you one remain  
Ye brethren who the Saviour know,  
Who're freed from sin's accursed chain,  
Whose very spirit doth not glow  
For Surinam and Thomas Isle,  
For Pensilvania and Barbies,  
The Cape and Greenland's distant soil,  
The Calumeks and Cherichees,

Who for the heathen hath not burnt and glowed  
To dip them in the stream of Jesus' blood?

If they sung about "Greenland's icy mountains" it was their service that was their song; they actually went there as far back as the year 1733. Do not forget that their missionary field, too, included London, and that it was at their meeting at Aldersgate Street that a certain Oxford man felt a strange warmth in his heart and was persuaded that Christ had forgiven his sins, even his. It is all done with a joyous lilt that is itself the language of youth; they even called themselves the "Babes of Christ, the Lamb of God."



# What I Believe in and Why.

## I.

### I Believe in the Saint.

By the Saint I mean the Christian. But I prefer the name Saint. Christian is a nickname. It was given by the outsider, perhaps the enemy. 'The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch.' Saints is the name they used of themselves. 'Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God, to the saints which are at Ephesus.' 'Salute every saint in Christ Jesus.' 'All the saints salute you, especially they that are of Cæsar's household.'

I prefer the name Saint for another reason. It means something. We all claim to be Christians, or nearly all. This is a Christian country. So is Germany. It does not seem to mean anything. But we do not all claim to be Saints. How many of us do? We shrink from the name. We had rather not be called Saints. There was a merchant in Aberdeen at one time whose name was James Saint. One day a letter was sent to him but addressed by mistake to Edinburgh. When it reached the Post Office there the officials wrote on the envelope, 'No Saints in Edinburgh; try Aberdeen.' A letter came once to Ephesus. It was addressed 'To the saints which are at Ephesus.' It was claimed at once by those to whom it was addressed. How many are there now in Edinburgh or Aberdeen who would be ready to claim a letter addressed to 'the Saints'? If it were addressed to 'the Christians,' that would be different. But 'Saints' means something.

'Saints' means the people of God. 'Christians' means the people of Christ. The Saints are those who, through Christ, have been reconciled to God. They are God's own. They have been bought, with a price. A Christian may be no more than a follower of Christ in the way which John Stuart Mill recommended. But a Saint is dedicated to God, consecrated to God's service, a holy one. And that word 'holy'—all the Mills hate it. They are ready to be called Christians of a kind, but 'holy ones' is more than they can stand.

I believe in the Saint just because he has come through Christ to God. He is one with God in will. He is one in heart. He is (potentially at any rate) what God would have him to be, what

God intended that he should be when He brought him into the world. He is the highest, he is the best, on earth. There is no man who deserves to be called a man so unreservedly as the Saint. I believe in the Saint. And I will tell you why.

## I.

I believe in the Saint *because I have seen an Infant.*

What have I seen in an Infant? I have seen a human Body. It is the most wonderful piece of machinery that has ever been seen on earth. What an astonishing thing is the eye, the ear, the voice.

Have you ever held in your hand an infant's foot? Of course every mother has, and she has expressed her wonder in the way that is so natural to mothers, and so ridiculous to other people. There she is with the little foot in one hand and with the other she takes the toes one by one; 'This little pig went to market; this pig stayed at home'; and all the rest of it. But you? Have you ever held an infant's foot in your hand and felt the softness of it, the firmness of it, the warmth? Have you observed the perfect finish of every part of it, down to the last little pink toe-nail? And have you ever asked yourself what it is for? Have you ever considered that it is meant by God to be the foot of a Saint?

There is a series of books, once quite popular, called the 'Bridgewater Treatises.' One of them is known as *Bell on the Hand*. Bell was a great man in his day. Sir Charles Bell, K.G.H., F.R.S. (L. and E.), Professor in the Royal College of Surgeons and Member of the Council—that is his designation on the title-page. The language of the book is old-fashioned now and sounds somewhat stilted, but the meaning is plain enough. This is the very first sentence: 'If we select any object from the whole extent of animated nature, and contemplate it fully and in all its bearings, we shall certainly come to this conclusion: that there is design in the mechanical construction, benevolence in the endowments of the living properties,



and that good on the whole is the result.' What Sir Charles Bell means is that the hand was made by God to be the hand of a Saint. And as to the 'good on the whole'—that will depend upon how we use it. Do we use our own bodies, do we watch over the bodies of our infants, with this for ever in our minds, that they are intended by God to be the bodies of Saints? The Saint is the best man possible, and he needs the best possible body. I believe in the Saint because I have seen an Infant.

## II.

I believe in the Saint *because I have seen a Child.*

What have I seen in a Child? I have seen a human MIND. I have seen the awakening of understanding, of intelligence. I have seen the beginning of knowledge, and of the desire for more knowledge. I have seen the first evidence of the ability to think.

Sometimes we remember this first evidence in our own life. Mary Howitt in her Autobiography says: 'I recollect a curious little epoch in my life, as we were returning one evening from a forest ramble with my father. It was the first evidence to my mind that I could think. I remember very well the new light, the gladness, the wealth of which I seemed suddenly possessed.' I have a similar recollection. I had found out how to tell the time of day. The school inspection came on. I was in the infant class. H.M. Inspector held out his watch. 'Who can tell me what o'clock it is?' There was a pause. I had learned to read a clock—but a watch? A classmate knew my accomplishment: 'He can,' with a pointed finger. And I succeeded. It was a day of triumph.

How does the opening of intelligence show itself? Chiefly as Curiosity or as Ambition. These we call instincts. We say we are born with them. And we have faculties to bring these instincts into exercise, so that the instincts do not remain mere instincts but are directed by intelligence. The faculty which curiosity uses is Observation. The faculty which ambition employs is Imagination. Both instincts are usually in evidence in the child, and both should have their opportunity. Observation should be directed and imagination should be cultivated. There is a school I know in which observation is encouraged by questions in the morning: How many buttons on your coat? How many persons whom you have seen before did you

pass on the way to school? And imagination is encouraged in the afternoon. An Old Testament tale is read, or a Greek myth, and the pupils are left to think.

When the instinct of curiosity is strong in a child he observes carefully, and he asks questions. Sometimes his questions are disconcerting, sometimes quite unanswerable, and his curiosity becomes troublesome. We lose patience. If we would remember that this instinct of curiosity is given him to make his mind the mind of a Saint, we might be more patient. If it is a strong instinct and is well trained, especially if the faculty of observation is wisely directed, he may become a great leader in science—a Newton, a Darwin, a Marconi. But he may always become a Saint.

The ambitious child builds castles in the air:

The bonnie, bonnie bairn, sits pokin' in the ase,  
Glowerin' in the fire wi' his wee round face;  
Lauchin' at the fuffin' lowe, what sees he there?  
Ha! the young dreamer's biggin' castles in the air.

Imagination is at work. Behind the things seen he sees something that to the observant eye is unseen:

He sees muckle castles towerin' to the moon!  
He sees little sodgers pu'in' them a' doun!  
Worlds whomlin' up and doun, bleezing wi' a flare,—  
See how he loup as they glimmer in the air.

When his faculty of imagination is strong, well developed, and given freedom, he may become a poet—a Homer, a Dante, a Shakespeare. But certainly he may become a Saint.

I want to put in a plea for the cultivation of the imagination. The faculty of observation is more likely to come to its own. It is developed more rapidly. It pays better. Curiosity may be troublesome in the child, but it makes the prosperous man of business. What good is likely to come by the free use of the imagination?

He'll glower at the fire and he'll keek at the licht!  
But mony sparklin' stars are swallowed up by Nicht;  
Aulder een than his are glamoured by a glare,  
Hearts are broken, heads are turned, wi' castles in the air.



That is the popular notion. It is not friendly to the imagination. It is afraid of it. But if the child's imagination is repressed, what will he do when he discovers that he is a mere machine for grinding out facts and has lost the power of appreciating poetry? We remember Darwin's bitter cry. And what will he do when he has to face the fact of God? They 'endured, as seeing him who is invisible.' How could they have endured otherwise? It seems to me that the failure of our appeal to men to have faith in God in these days is largely due to the atrophy of their imagination. They have been encouraged to act but not to think. They have been trained to see the things which are seen but not the things which are unseen. Now 'the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.' And 'what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?'

I want to put in a plea for the exercise of the imagination, and that from the earliest days right on to the latest. I want you to encourage 'Make-believe.' The children play to-day as they played in Christ's day. They play at weddings, 'We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced'; they play at funerals, 'we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented.' They play at 'make-believe' all the world over. Did you take note of that beautiful example among Muhammad's children which was quoted in this magazine two months ago? I want to put in a plea for the encouragement of 'make-believe' in the young and in the old. And I will give you an example:

It was an old, old, old, old lady,  
And a boy who was half-past three;  
And the way that they played together  
Was beautiful to see.

She couldn't go running and jumping,  
And the boy no more could he,  
For he was a thin little pale-faced fellow,  
With a thin, little, twisted knee.

They sat in the yellow sunlight,  
Out under the maple tree;  
And the game that they played I'll tell you,  
Just as it was told to me.

It was Hide-and-go-Seek they were playing,  
Though you'd never have known it to be—  
With an old, old, old, old lady,  
And a boy with a twisted knee.

The boy would bend his face down,  
On his one little sound right knee;  
And he'd guess where she was hiding,  
In guesses One, Two, Three!

'You are in the china-closet!'  
He would cry and laugh with glee—  
It wasn't the china-closet;  
But still he had Two and Three.

'You are in papa's big bedroom,  
In the chest with the queer old key!'  
And she said: 'You are *warm*, and *warmer*,  
But you're not quite right,' said she.

'It can't be the little cupboard  
Where Mamma's things used to be—  
No, it must be the clothes-press, gran'ma!'  
And he found her with his Three.

Then she covered her face with her fingers,  
Which were wrinkled and white and wee,  
And she guessed where the boy was hiding,  
With a One and a Two and a Three.

And they never had stirred from their places  
Right under the maple tree—  
This old, old, old, old lady,  
And the boy with the lame little knee.  
This dear, dear, dear, old lady  
And the boy who was half-past three.

I believe in the Saint because I have seen a Child.

### III.

I believe in the Saint *because I have seen a Boy.*

What have I seen in a Boy? I have seen a human SOUL. I have seen the dawn of the moral sense, the recognition of right and wrong, the necessity of making a choice.

The discovery that there is right and wrong in the world, and that a decision has to be taken upon them, is made very early by some, later by others. But it is made by all. It approaches in the form of temptation. That is the way in which it approached Eve, and that is the way in which it approaches everybody.

Now temptation is not an evil in itself. It is simply a testing. 'Count it all joy,' says the



Apostle James, 'when ye fall into manifold temptations.' It is an opportunity to declare oneself, to rise above oneself, to begin to be something of the Saint God made one to be. Says Browning:

When a fight begins within himself,  
A man's worth something.

And we may change the word 'man' into 'boy.' For temptation comes in boyhood and is as hard and as decisive then as at any after period of life. It has to be faced. And it is worth facing. Hear Browning again:

Was the trial sore?  
Temptation sharp? Thank God a second time!  
Why comes temptation but for man to meet  
And master and make crouch beneath his foot,  
And so be pedestaled in triumph?

There are three forms in which temptation meets us—three and no more. And they come, one to the body, and two to the mind. For we are not tempted on the unknown future; that would make temptation irresistible and therefore unjust. We are tempted only on the present. That is what Browning means when he says:

What,  
And will you disbelieve in power to bid  
Our spirit back to bounds, as though we chid  
A child from scrutiny that's just and right.  
In manhood?

If we have used the body well, remembering that it is the body of a Saint, we shall meet the first temptation unhampered. The temptations of the mind are to its instincts. They come to the instinct of ambition or of curiosity. And again, if the faculties that guide these instincts have been well disciplined, the temptation is fairly and even hopefully encountered. The body, ambition, curiosity—they are all gifts of God; and as temptation comes only to God's gifts we may be sure that if we are faithful no temptation will take us but such as we are able to bear, for God will make also the way of escape so that we may be able to endure it. And then we shall be ready to sing with James, 'Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he hath been approved, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord promised to them that love him.'

Temptation comes first to the body. It came so to Eve, 'When she saw that the tree was good

for food.' It came so to Christ. 'He hungered; and the devil said unto him, If thou art the Son of God, command this stone that it become bread.' It is the temptation to put the needs or the appetites of the body first. The boy has discovered good and evil; he has to make a choice; if he chooses *duty before pleasure*, he has won that battle.

Then temptation comes to the mind, and first to the instinct of ambition. It came so to Eve: 'and that it was pleasant to the eyes.' Eve had begun to build her castles in the air. It came so to Christ: 'And he led him up, and shewed him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the devil said unto him, To thee will I give all this authority, and the glory of them.' It is the offer of *power without sacrifice*. Jesus will obtain the authority and the glory, but not without the sacrifice of the Cross. For there is no power worth having but the power that is built upon love. Eve might have had her highest ambition satisfied if she had sacrificed her selfishness for the love of God. And there is no stretch of imagination that can conceive the rewards which God has promised to them that love Him. But the love of God is only sacrificial love.

The last temptation is to the instinct of curiosity. It came so to Eve: 'And that it was a tree to be desired to make one wise.' It came so to Christ: 'And he led him to Jerusalem, and set him on the pinnacle of the temple, and said unto him, If thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down from hence.' It is the pursuit of *knowledge without reverence*.

Let knowledge grow from more to more,  
But more of reverence in us dwell.

Eve obtained more knowledge than she had; it was 'a tree to make one wise.' But God was not with her as she passed into her new experience. Jesus was tempted to enter upon a new experience also—an experience into which the Father had not sent Him, and in which therefore the Father would not have been with Him. This is the temptation against which James warns us when he says, 'Each man is tempted, when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed.' 'If you play with temptation,' said Mary Slessor, 'do not expect God will deliver you.'

What so false as truth is,  
False to thee?  
Where the serpent's tooth is,  
Shun the tree—



Where the apple reddens  
 Never pry—  
 Lest we lose our Edens,  
 Eve and I.

All through life the body has to be cared for as the body of a Saint. All through life the mind has to be educated as the mind of a Saint. And all through life temptation comes to the soul, and the soul has to meet it as the soul of a Saint. But it is in boyhood that the temptation comes first. I believe in the Saint because I have seen a Boy.

#### IV.

I believe in the Saint *because I have seen a Young Man.*

What have I seen in a Young Man? I have seen a human SPIRIT. I have seen a man face to face with God.

Speak to him thou for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet—

Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.

We have seen the awakening of bodily life in infancy, of mental life in childhood, of moral life in boyhood; when does the awakening of the spiritual life take place? In early manhood nearly always. An American psychologist some time ago sent out inquiries to a large number of persons whose spiritual life was clearly awake, and asked them to say when the awakening took place. The answer of the great majority was, 'about the age of eighteen.'

And that is what we should expect. For it is often either human love or human sorrow that is the occasion of its birth. In the *Life and Letters of J. P. Struthers* there are many extracts from the diary of that very observant Scottish minister. This is one: 'I have had some very happy talks with my young communicants. One girl told me that the 45th Psalm impressed her at her sister's funeral some years ago. We had sung "Her fellow virgins following," etc. A lad, too, told me with tears that it was love to his sweetheart that brought him to Christ. I thought that very bonnie.'

It is the discovery of love as a power in life that leads to the discovery of God. And the first effect of the discovery is freedom. It is the release of

life from the restraints of tutors and governors. That is the first effect. It is still duty before pleasure, but duty is no longer a commandment uttered from without, it is a sense of personal responsibility felt within—responsibility, too, not to man but to God. What talents has a young man? As soon as his spirit awakens to God, his thought is that these talents are gifts of God, and that he has to render an account of the use of them. Is it the speaking talent? When they asked Daniel Webster what was the greatest thought that he ever had, he answered, 'My personal responsibility as a speaker to God.' Is it the talent of Song? Canon Scott Holland, in his book of 'Personal Studies,' speaks of Jenny Lind's 'intense conviction that her art was a gift of God, to be dedicated to His service.'

Where is the use of lip's red charm,  
 The heaven of hair, the pride of the brow,  
 And the blood that blues the inside arm—

Unless we turn, as the soul knows how,  
 The earthly gift to an end divine?  
 'A lady of clay is as good, I trow.'

Or is the first thought the thought of Failure? If it is not first, it is pretty sure to be second, and a bitter thought it is. The boy has already had his moments of humiliation, even of remorse. But this is different. This is the sense of sin. The wrong choice has been made again and again, and it has been followed by sorrow and repentance and new effort. But now the thought of failure is the thought that 'against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight.'

That is why we now see the possible Saint at the parting of the ways. His body is to be the body of a Saint—therefore did God make it so fearfully and wonderfully. His mind is to be the mind of a Saint—that also is the purpose of God, and the making of the mind of a Saint is more, as it seems to me, than the making of his body. And the soul is tested, day after day, and by all the temptations that are common to man, that he may be 'perfect and entire,' as James says, 'wanting nothing.' But it will all be in vain, and there will never be the Saint God gave body mind and soul for, unless the spirit, face to face with the fact of God, sees that there is forgiveness that He may be feared.

The forgiveness is in Christ. That is where



Christ comes in. He has been heard of before. Very likely He has been found altogether lovely before. But His mission on earth was to sinners, and it was to forgive them. We do not know Christ if we have never heard Him say, Son, thy sins are forgiven thee; Daughter, be of good cheer, thy faith hath made thee whole.

The last thought is of Purpose. When the—what do we call it?—when the conversion to God has taken place—(but it may take place in as many different ways as there are persons to be converted. We err here as often and as seriously as anywhere. We insist on our own conversion being after the pattern of some other Saint's conversion, perhaps after the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. But God deals with each of us differently, because we differ each from the other)—when the conversion has come to pass, though it may be nothing more than the awakened consciousness of love to Him who loved and gave Himself, with the relief that accompanies it, the last thought is, 'What wilt thou have me to do?'

And the doing is not to be a single act, or a single line of action, but readiness for every act and every possible line of action. It is the offering of the whole person for God's use. Do we call it surrender of the will? It is that. Do we call it consecration of head and heart, of hands and feet and voice? It is that also. It is what the Psalmist meant when he said, 'My times are in thy hand.' It is what the poet of our own day meant when he took the Psalmist for his text, and said:

So, take and use Thy work:

Amend what flaws may lurk,

What strain o' the stuff, what warpings past the aim!

My times be in Thy hand!

Perfect the cup as planned!

Let age approve of youth, and death complete the same!

It is the sense of responsibility with a new note. The new note is confidence, childlike confidence in God. He that has begun a good work in us will perfect it. And He will perfect every part of it. There will be no broken arcs. Livingstone is reported to have said, 'I am immortal till my work is done.' He could have said more. He could have said that every part of his work was immortal. Browning said it;

No work begun shall ever pause for death.

I believe in the Saint because I have seen a Young Man.

## V.

I believe in the Saint *because I have seen a Man in Middle Life.*

What have I seen in a Man in Middle Life? I have seen a MAN. I speak no longer of any part of a man, body or mind or soul or spirit; I speak of a man. I speak of a man of character and influence, the outcome of faithfulness to God's purpose in infancy, childhood, boyhood, youth—the outcome under God of the well-developed body of an infant, the trained intelligence of a child, the self-mastery of a boy, the young man's touch with God and continued fellowship through Christ. I have seen a Man; it is but one step more and I can say that I have seen a Saint.

Now the first thing noticeable about a man in middle life is that he has discovered the Second Commandment. The First Commandment is, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.' The young man discovered that. It was his great momentous discovery. The Second Commandment is, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour.' That is the discovery of the man in middle life. He has a duty to society. He takes part in the public life of the place in which he dwells. He is a politician (arresting the process of degeneration to which that word seems so fatally liable). He is a patriot, recognizing that other races have just the same right as his own race to life and liberty. And he makes his character tell, he makes his influence felt.

First of all by his *Sympathy*. He understands. He has gained understanding partly, perhaps very largely, through the cultivation of his imagination. And, because he understands, his sympathy is intelligent and helpful. He understands at a distance, and his understanding bridges the distance. You never heard him say, 'But I don't believe in missions.' He even understands at that greater distance which is degradation. He also is come to seek and to save that which is lost.

When Sir Colin Scott-Moncrieff was leaving Egypt, Nubar Pasha called. 'If you must go,' he said, 'see that you send a man of heart; mind not about his being a clever engineer; that is work easily got; but before all, send a man of heart.'

And he makes his influence felt by his *In-*



*dividuality*. He is himself. Referring everything first to God, his words are always, 'Lord, what wilt thou have *me* to do?' Individuality is not eccentricity. The eccentric man has become lopsided through uneven development. He is usually deficient in observation. Nor is it opinionativeness. The opinionative man is usually deficient in imagination. The true man is an all-round man, but he is himself and no copy of another. This is the man he is:

'Only to-day,' says Dr. G. H. Rendall, 'I had an invitation to join in a memorial to one who, to a memorable degree, earned the esteem and trust of all who knew him as a solicitor in a great city. And how did he attain it? I will quote. "Because his friends will remember him as one who never failed them; in whom the pressure of work, or the fatigue of work, made not the slightest difference to his immediate and whole-hearted response to any call for sympathy, encouragement, or counsel: and whose encouragement and counsel were always based on a swift and just perception of facts, and a confident assumption that only the best instincts and the most unselfish ends would be allowed the last word. He expected them to think and act like their best selves just as he expected that of himself." That is a true judgment, which his closest friends—and they made a large circle—would all endorse.'

That is what I mean by a Man. If he is not a Saint, he is well on the way. I believe in the Saint because I have seen a Man in Middle Life.

## VI.

I believe in the Saint *because I have seen a Saint*. 'I saw a Saint'—this is Christina Rossetti; our most religious poet. It is a little difficult to listen to, but I will explain:

I saw a Saint.—How canst thou tell that he  
Thou sawest was a Saint?—

I saw one like to Christ so luminously  
By patient deeds of love, his mortal taint  
Seemed made his groundwork for humility.

What is that? It is likeness to Christ—an unmistakable mark of a Saint. Christ was more than a Saint; He was a Saviour. But He was a

Saint. Body, mind, soul, spirit—all were at their best and made the best Man, the Man and the only Man wholly after God's own heart. Likeness to Christ *luminously*. That is, in the full light of day, with all eyes on him, so that men see, and they cannot help seeing, that he is like to Christ. That is the first thing, like to Christ luminously. But there is another:

And when he marked me downcast utterly  
Where foul I sat and faint,  
Then more than ever Christ-like kindled he;  
And welcomed me as I had been a saint,  
Tenderly stooping low to comfort me.

The second thing, you see, is the faculty of discovering other saints.

Now that is a rather rare faculty. It is easy enough to discover sinners. We have but to cast our eyes round us, the sinners are on every hand, we cannot miss them, and we rarely do. But the faculty of discovering saints is rare. And it is very precious. For sometimes the saints are discovered among the sinners:

And when he marked me downcast utterly  
Where foul I sat and faint.

Is it possible that to discover a saint in a sinner is only another way of turning a sinner into a saint? It is very likely. That is apparently what Christina Rossetti means. For the last verse of her poem is:

Christ bade him, 'Do thou likewise.' Wherefore he

Waxed zealous to acquaint  
His soul with sin and sorrow, if so be  
He might retrieve some latent saint:—  
'Lo, I, with the child God hath given to me!'

Some latent saint, you see. That is some saint whose sainthood is not quite visible yet. How is the latent saint turned into a luminous saint? By sympathy, by hope, and perseverance, and faith, by never doubting that there are saints round us as well as sinners, and that God has bade us—'Do thou likewise.'

I believe in the Saint because I have seen a Saint.



## In the Study.

### *Virginibus Puerisque.*

#### I.

#### October.

#### THE DAWN OF THE YEAR.

'This month shall be unto you the beginning of months; it shall be the first month of the year to you.'—Ex 12<sup>2</sup>.

SOME of you may have visited an old farm; possibly you have lived at one. Among the things you saw there, you will remember a strange looking machine in the cornyard. It was like a merry-go-round in a fair. If you were lucky enough to be at the farm in late autumn, you would have seen a horse yoked to this machine and being driven round and round in a circle, making the great thing move while it went. Now, it is not the machine I want you to think of, but the horse. It had to plod on patiently over the same round for hours, kept going all the time by the man beside it with the whip.

You boys and girls are inclined to think of school life as being something like this—a dull dreary affair, one continual round of work that never seems to stop. You forget that although in a sense your work goes round in a circle, it is a circle not in the least like that of the farmyard wheel. The whip need not be there at all, and there is a break after every round. After each break you start afresh, and if you have been working you find yourselves on a slightly higher level.

You have just had your break. It may have meant a holiday at the seaside or in the country. I know of some brave and patient little people who were at home all the time, waiting, sometimes even longing, for the wheel to start again.

Is there not something about October that makes us feel we are off on the new round—the sharp air, the frost on the grass, the grey mornings? It is the beginning of our year. For the big boys and girls that may mean a great deal; perhaps an entrance to the University or a chance to do better there. One October many years ago, a very clever lad tried a University bursary competition. He did not take a high place, but it entitled him to a small bursary. 'I felt I did not

deserve one at all,' he wrote to his sister, 'but now I am working like a Hollander.'

The new start may mean going into business. The other day I met a boy who had just left the Sunday School. 'I'm a chemist now,' he said, 'I'll be an apprentice till I'm nearly eighteen; that's *old*.' He had an idea of rising in the world, for he went on to say, 'I may enlist after that, or if the war's over, I'll try to make money enough to build a house for my mother.'

Some of you will have joined the Latin class for the first time. A knowledge of Latin opens a door to wonderful secrets. And the Greek class—there are great books written in Greek; the very greatest of these is our New Testament. The younger boys and girls have nearly all got new books: even the very wee ones can show their new primers. Ever upwards you boys and girls go, as October comes round—October, the dawn of the year.

'This month shall be unto you the beginning of months; it shall be the first month of the year to you.' These were the words of the Lord that came to the Israelites through Moses. It meant the beginning of their freedom from bondage. They would be feeling very solemn; their boys and girls would be almost afraid to ask questions, but you may feel sure they were eager to know what the new life was to be like.

The setting out is always hopeful. The most wearisome part of a journey is not the end but the middle—January, February, March—tramp, tramp, tramp, the brave boys and girls will keep up their courage then; they will set a stout heart to the long level road.

October will come again. Ever ascending, you will one day come to a place from which you can look down and say, 'I remember the reading-book that really set me to work, I got it one October morning.' Better still, from the heights you may one day be able to look through a glass and see something of the glory that is in store for those who have hungered for the hilltop of goodness. Jesus Himself said that those are blessed who hunger and thirst after righteousness. If you begin to do that to-day, 'this month shall be unto you the beginning of months; it shall be the first month of the year to you.'



## II.

## Smoke.

'Smoke out of the chimney.'—Hos 13<sup>3</sup>.

That is a thing that nobody likes. Many people like smoke out of a pipe, but nobody likes smoke out of the chimney—especially when it is in the wrong place and comes down the chimney instead of going up. Smoke is dirty and disagreeable and harmful. It covers our tables and chairs and cushions with specks of soot, and it makes us cough and choke.

1. I think smoke is one of the lesser worries of life, and so I am going to take it to-day as a picture of the little frets and bothers and disagreeable things that come our way. Well, you know, these are the things that come to us every day. We are in a hurry to get to school; we pull off a button or break a boot-lace; we have to wait till the button is sewed on or the lace replaced; and so we are late for school. Then the teacher scolds and we have to stay after hours or write an imposition. Or perhaps our trouble takes another form. A tooth aches, or we cut our finger, or we lose some little thing we value, or a school friend is offended and won't speak to us. There are dozens of these little annoyances that are apt to come to us any day.

The question is—What are we to do about them?

(1) Well, when your chimney smokes, what do you do?—You send for the sweep. Of course you make sure first that your chimney is properly built, because some chimneys have a twist in them or are too low or have a loose brick inside, and no amount of sweeping will prevent their smoking. But when you have made sure that your chimney is properly built, the next thing you do is to see that it is kept clean.

Now that is exactly what we must do with our little troubles and worries. Those that can be prevented or cured it is our business to prevent or cure, and a great many of them can be dealt with in this way. If you rise a few minutes earlier in the morning you will probably not pull off buttons or break laces, and supposing you do, you will have time to put them right. If your tooth aches, visit the dentist. If you lose your possessions, put them away more carefully in future. If one of your friends cuts you, speak to him and find out

the reason. It is probably a little misunderstanding which can quite easily be cleared up. At any rate, give him the chance of explaining. Friends are far too precious to be lost over a silly trifle. If you only take a little trouble about your troubles it is wonderful how many of them disappear.

(2) Learn to consume your own smoke. What does that mean? Well, you know when smoke comes out at the top of a chimney it looks like a black or grey cloud, but when it gets a little bit away it seems to disperse or vanish away. Now it does not really disappear altogether. Some of it goes off in gases which mix with the atmosphere, the rest comes down in soot specks or hangs in the air and causes a fog. So in some large towns where there are many tall factory chimneys, they have a plan whereby each chimney burns its own smoke.

And so I am going to say to you—burn your own smoke, and that just means—bear your own little troubles. Don't always be bothering other people with them and asking for sympathy and help. You will make yourself a nuisance, and nobody will want to know you. If things are not just as you would like them, then make the best of them as they are, but don't worry others about every little quarrel you have, and every little bump you give your head, and every little difficulty you meet.

There was once a little girl of four whose mother had met with a bicycle accident and was badly bruised. She asked her mother if she had been hurt, and when mother replied, 'Yes, dear, dreadfully,' Violet said, 'Well, Mummy, when you don't *find* of what you don't like, it seems to go away. That's what I find.'

Try that plan instead of complaining. Try not to think of the things you don't like. It is wonderful how many of them will seem to go away.

2. But it is not only things that are a trouble, people can be a nuisance too. There are some boys and girls who are a trouble to everybody. They always seem to be getting into somebody's black books, and they are just like smoke out of the chimney—a bother to everybody.

Well, if there are any boys and girls like that here, I want to remind them of the proverb which says that there is no smoke without fire. Smoke



is not a good thing in itself, but it is a sign of something good, for when we see smoke we know that somewhere there is a spark of fire; and a fire is a good friend, who warms us, and cheers us, and cooks our food.

And there is good in the 'smoky' people too. Somewhere underneath that black disagreeable exterior there is a fire burning. The only mistake they are making is that they are burning in the wrong way. For smoke is really wasted fuel, and scientists tell us that if we knew how to burn a fire properly there would be no smoke.

Nothing is really 'good for nothing.' You may be constantly getting into scrapes, and people may treat you as if you were no good. But God knows better. He knows that you have the making of something fine in you, and if you will let Him take you in hand, then out of the smoke He can make a beautiful, glowing fire.

### III.

#### Seals.

'Clay under the seal.'—Job 38<sup>14</sup>.

Have you ever played at making seals? It is a fascinating game. All you require is a lighted candle, a stick of sealing-wax, a piece of paper, and the loan of a die or a signet-ring from father or mother. Hold the sealing-wax in the candle-flame until it is soft enough to drop on the paper. When you have dropped the spot of wax, take your die or signet and stamp it quickly, evenly, and firmly in the hot wax. Keep it there for a minute, then raise it gently, and you will find that the motto or crest or initials on your die will be imprinted on the wax. You may not make a very neat job the first time you try it, or even the third time, or perhaps the thirtieth—the wax may look black and smoked, the impression may be faint at one part, or the drop of wax may not have been the right shape, and a piece of the seal may be wanting. It is all a case of practice, and practice makes perfection. Go on trying if mother does not object to your using a lighted candle, and father does not grudge the wax.

If they do, I'll tell you of an easier, cheaper, and safer way to make seals which requires neither wax, nor candle, nor paper—only the die or signet and your own willing hand. Press the die for a short time on the back of your hand. When you raise it you will find the device stamped perfectly on

your flesh. Of course it will fade in a few minutes, but, since it costs nothing, you can do it over and over again, till you grow tired of the game.

Most of the seals we are accustomed to see are made of wax, but seals have been and still are made of other materials—of metal, for instance. In the Middle Ages the Popes used to attach leaden seals called *bullae* (from the Latin word *bullā* meaning a circular ornament) to their decrees, and that is how we read in history books of Papal 'bulls.'

Sometimes, but rarely, the seals were made of gold. When a Pope wanted to confer a title on a monarch he sealed the document with a golden seal. When one of the Popes gave our own King Henry the Eighth the title of 'Defender of the Faith,' he sealed the paper with a golden seal, and you can see that very seal to-day if you look for it in the British Museum.

But the kind of seal of which our text speaks is much older than that given to Henry the Eighth. It is a seal made of neither metal nor wax, for the material on which it is stamped is clay. It was the kind of seal used by the Babylonians and Assyrians thousands of years ago. They took the moist clay and they stamped it with the die, and then they baked it hard in the oven or in the sun. There still exist some of these ancient clay seals with the marks where the string or strip of leather was fastened to them. And you may see too the very dies or stamps or *matrices*, as they are called, which made the impression. These early dies were not shaped like ours; they were often round like a roller, and as they rolled over the soft clay they left a figured impression behind.

Boys and girls, I think we are rather like that piece of clay. When we come into the world we are like the smooth soft mass without any marks on it, but as life rolls on it leaves, as the roller leaves on the clay, a lasting impression on us. But though we may be like the clay in some ways, we are unlike it in this, that we can choose the kind of impression or pattern that will be stamped on us. We can say whether it will be a good and beautiful impression that we shall bear, or whether it will be one both distorted and ugly. It all depends who holds the die. If we go to Christ and say to Him, 'Here is my life all before me, help me to make it good and beautiful; help me to make the very best of it; help me to stamp it truly and



well'; if we say that to Christ, He will take the die into His own hand, and He will stamp our life for us.

And what do you think the impression will be? Why, it will be just a portrait of Himself. In olden days the kings had on their royal seals their

own portraits, and when they stamped anything with the royal seal every one knew it belonged to the king, for they saw his image there. So with Christ's seal. Others looking on us, and seeing the impression on our clay, will say, 'They too belong to Christ.'

## Discerning the Body.

BY THE REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN THE UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

WHAT does Paul mean by this elliptical phrase in his description of the Christian's relation to the Lord's Supper? The passage (1 Co 11<sup>29</sup>) runs thus: 'For he who eats and drinks without a proper sense of the body (μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα), eats and drinks to his own condemnation.' It falls to be interpreted in the light of the preceding discussion upon the meaning of the Lord's Supper, and the variety of opinions with regard to 10<sup>16f.</sup> 11<sup>17f.</sup> is reflected in the variety of interpretations assigned to 11<sup>29</sup>. The problem has been again opened by Professor Morgan in his recent original work on *The Religion and Theology of Paul* (p. 224). It is of vital importance for the understanding of Paul's attitude towards the sacrament; but, before referring to Professor Morgan's theory, we had better survey the rival interpretations of the phrase.

They fall into two groups, familiar to students of the Epistle and its criticism. (i.) The most obvious is, 'not discriminating between the body' of the Lord, as represented by the consecrated bread, and the ordinary bread at the church Supper. The greedy, selfish person who snatches at the food, till often none is left for others, acts ἀναξίως (v.<sup>27</sup>); he fails to see that there is any real difference between the bread and wine of this Supper and the provisions at an ordinary meal. Such behaviour, as Paul has said, 'makes it impossible for you to eat the Lord's supper (κυριᾶκὸν δεῖπνον) when you hold your gatherings' (v.<sup>20</sup>). It is an act of irreverence, which renders the perpetrator guilty of sacrilege, in the ancient sense of the term, namely, guilty of violating a sacred order which avenges itself upon the offender. He has to answer for a sin against (ἐνὸς, v.<sup>27</sup>) the body and the blood of

the Lord, represented by the bread and wine; as he eats and drinks, in his profane, careless way, he involves himself in a condemnation or κρίμα (v.<sup>29</sup>), which comes immediately into operation (v.<sup>30</sup>).

This view seems to tally with the situation at Corinth. From Paul's language (11<sup>17f.</sup>) we gather that the local church was in the habit of gathering for an evening love-feast or charity-supper, at which the Eucharist was also celebrated. This love-feast was the Christian equivalent for the supper of the guilds; it was not a 'sacrament' in the modern sense of the term, i.e. a gathering at which the eating is only a form, but a real supper<sup>1</sup> of the church, the food being provided by the wealthier members in the main. Only, at Corinth some were in the habit of hurrying to eat what they had brought, without waiting for the poor slaves or tradesmen who could not arrive till their day's task was done. This indecent behaviour was a disgrace to the church. It showed the cliques and sets within the church; it brought out invidious distinctions of social position, which were entirely out of keeping with the unity of the Church as the Lord's Body. Also, it left the late-comers with little or nothing to eat at all. Finally, it betrayed a gross disrespect for the religious aspect of the loaf and the cup. According to the interpretation under review, it is this last point which is pressed home by the apostle in v.<sup>29</sup>. No one who had a proper sense of what the bread and the wine at the love-feast of the Lord meant, would behave so greedily that some of his fellow-members would have to go without any of the food, while

<sup>1</sup> 'Un vrai souper, où chacun mangeait selon sa faim, seulement avec une haute intention mystique' (Renan, *S. Paul*, p. 265).



he himself might actually be drunk by partaking too freely of the wine (v.<sup>21</sup>).<sup>1</sup> If you want to give dinners to each other or to satisfy your appetites merely, do that at home (v.<sup>22</sup>); there the bread and the wine are not what they are at the κυριακὸν δείπνον.

(ii.) Another interpretation is: 'Not taking a right view of the body' (as represented in the bread), *i.e.* failing to appreciate the full and deep significance of the bread as a religious symbol or sign. Instead of blaming the Christians at Corinth for failing to draw a difference between the efficacy of the sacramental loaf and an ordinary loaf, the apostle is supposed to warn them against an inadequate appreciation of the sacramental loaf itself. Apparently this was the view of Chrysostom (μὴ ἐξετάζων, μὴ ἐννοῶν, ὡς χρῆ, τὸ μέγεθος τῶν προκειμένων, μὴ λογιζόμενος τὸν ὄγκον τῆς δωρεᾶς); the man 'does not inquire into, does not understand, as he should, the greatness of what is put before him, does not appreciate the importance of the free gift.'

But where did this lack of spiritual apprehension lie? The interpretation branches into two lines.

(a) According to some, especially Dean Stanley, for example, by 'the Body' is meant the unity of the Christian Church as the Lord's Body, a unity which is broken and disparaged by the selfish conduct of these Corinthians. In 10<sup>16f.</sup>, 'after asking, 'The cup of blessing, which we bless, is that not participating in the blood of Christ? the bread we break, is that not participating in the body of Christ?'—the apostle at once adds, in a parenthesis 'for many as we are, we are one bread, one body, since we all partake of the one bread.' This instinctive comment shows how deeply the idea of the unity of the Church, as prefigured in the Eucharist, had penetrated the mind of Paul; it shows also that, after speaking of the bread and the cup, he could sum up the particular significance of the Supper as 'the bread,' and correlate that with 'the body.' This figurative or mystical sense of 'the body'<sup>2</sup> is held to underlie μὴ διακρίνων τὸ

σῶμα in 11<sup>29</sup>. What Paul has been censuring (v.<sup>18f.</sup>) is the selfishness and lack of consideration at the church gatherings, the display of party-spirit and unbrotherly greed. What he desires is a due appreciation, on the part of each worshipper, of what membership in 'the body' involves. To partake of the Supper properly, one must recognize it as imposing obligations of brotherly love and fellowship. To eat and drink 'worthily' (ἀξίως) is to do so recognizing that they are 'participating in the body and the blood of the Lord' (κοινωνοὶ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου). In fact, the Body (τὸ σῶμα) here recalls the Church (τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ) of v.<sup>22</sup>.

The stress laid by this interpretation<sup>3</sup> upon the unity of the Church corresponds to the introductory paragraph (vv.<sup>19-22</sup>) and to the conclusion (vv.<sup>33-34</sup>), in which Paul reiterates his protest against the selfishness which reduced the supper to a private meal, instead of a common gathering for fellowship. The stress of the other (β) line falls upon the use of σῶμα in the special account of vv.<sup>23-27</sup>, as the sacrificial body of the Lord in connexion with the bread or loaf of the Eucharist. In μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα, Paul censures the indifference of the Corinthian Church, or of some of its members, to the true meaning of the bread (v.<sup>24</sup>, 'this is my body,' τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα). He therefore recalls them to the interpretation of the rite which he had originally given them (v.<sup>23</sup>, 'which also I delivered to you,' ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν), in close connexion with the death of Christ. At Corinth he had emphasized this truth, set it vividly before their conscience and imagination, 'proclaiming' it (2<sup>1f.</sup>, καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ οὗ γὰρ ἔκρινα τι εἰδέναι ἐν ὑμῖν εἰ μὴ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ τοῦτον ἐσταυρωμένον), and he had instructed them on the meaning of the Supper from the same point of view as a rite in which they 'proclaimed' the death of the Lord (11<sup>23f.</sup>, note ὅσακις ἐὰν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνετε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, 11<sup>26</sup>). What had led the Corinthians to ignore or undervalue this inter-

of Christ's presence with the Church, for Paul, though the Synoptic formula, 'This is my body,' meant 'the body of Christ as the unity of the church.' This is doubly wrong.

<sup>3</sup> It tallies with the prayer over the bread in the Didachē (9<sup>4</sup>): 'As this broken bread was scattered upon the hills and was brought together and made one, so let thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom'—although the reference is eschatological, and slightly fanciful.

<sup>1</sup> 'One took the holy bread to assuage his hunger, another drank the wine when he had already confused his brains by drinking, making no distinction between this and any other bread and wine' (Hausrath, *History of N. T. Times*, iv. 27).

<sup>2</sup> As in 12<sup>12-13</sup> ('by one Spirit we have all been baptized into one body'), 12<sup>27</sup> ('you are Christ's body, and severally members of it'), etc. Weizsäcker (*Apostolic Age*, ii. 282), reading τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν in 11<sup>24</sup>, refused to see any allusion to Christ's death except in the cup; the bread was the symbol



pretation, we can only guess. Was it a mere irreverent habit? Or had they begun to make the sacrificial meal, as in the light of contemporary cult-feasts, a means of participation in the life of the Risen Lord by eating and drinking (10<sup>16f</sup>)? Probably the former. But in any case they required to be brought back to the solemn truth that what they did was in remembrance of Christ's death, and that what they ought to do was to appropriate His death gratefully and eagerly.

Professor Morgan's view agrees with this. He finds the determining passage in 'This do in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come' (vv.<sup>25, 26</sup>), words which Paul added to the primitive tradition, and which form the index to his own conception. 'A memorial of Christ's sacrificial death, a means of proclaiming it—that and that alone is what the Supper signifies for Paul. And if we are right in supposing that he finds the Corinthian observance not merely disfigured by moral abuses, but also defective in the matter of knowledge, may we not say that what he misses in it is precisely the vital thing—a recognition of Christ's sacrificial death (cf. 1 Co 2<sup>1f</sup>). With all their striving after mystic knowledge and mystic union, the Corinthian Christians failed to "discern" in the Supper the Lord's broken body and shed blood. They were guilty of the body and blood of the Lord in the sense that they ignored and flouted the significance of these divine realities.' This is true to the reiterated mention of 'in memory of me' (*εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, vv.<sup>24, 25</sup>). The Supper was not to Paul a commemorative festival, as in some Greek guild a banquet might be held in annual memory of a departed member. The Lord was living (cf. 'till he come,' *ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ*, v.<sup>26</sup>). He was present as 'Lord' (*Κύριος*) at the Lord's Supper (*κυριακὸν δέειπνον*). But He was not present at it as He had been at the Supper 'on the night when he was betrayed.' That Supper was a prophetic anticipation of the death which the Christian Eucharist commemorates as the basis of living fellowship with God. Consequently to sin against 'the body and the blood of the Lord' is to sin against the sacrificial death, to be indifferent to what the Supper means for all true disciples. It has nothing to do with any failure to recognize in the actual loaf either a symbol of the divine reality or a vehicle for the transmission of

the Lord's life into the participant who digests his morsel.<sup>1</sup>

One of the crucial difficulties in deciding which of the various interpretations is correct, is not linguistic but historical. *Διακρίνων* may mean 'appreciating' in v.<sup>29</sup>, 'taking a right view of'—although it does not follow that Paul used so flexible a term in exactly the same sense both in 11<sup>29</sup> and in 11<sup>31</sup> (if we only judged our lives truly, we would not come under the Lord's judgment' = *εἰ δὲ ἑαυτοὺς διακρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα*); he might well be playing on the different meanings of the term, and in 4<sup>7</sup> he had certainly used the verb to mean 'discriminate' or 'single out' ('who maketh thee to differ, who singles you out?' *τίς γάρ σε διακρίνει*). The further and harder problem is, What was the precise situation to which he was referring? How was the Lord's Supper connected with the love-feast? We do not even know whether it was celebrated at the beginning or at the end of the common meal. The members at Corinth assembled, we may assume, 'in the Lord' (*ἐν κυρίῳ*) for a Lord's Supper (*κυριακὸν δέειπνον*), to be partaken of in presence of the Lord (*Κύριος*) as their invisible Host and Head, with whom, as they ate and drank, they were in vital union; the holy kiss and the breaking of bread together were simple, realistic expressions of their corporate unity; and a solemn blessing, invoking and recognizing the presence of the *Κύριος*, opened the meal. But was there a special loaf, was there a special cup, set apart for the Lord's Supper, during the course of the meal? Or were the entire materials of the simple feast regarded as consecrated by the initial blessing, so that the Church Supper corresponded to the 'breaking of bread' elsewhere, e.g. in the Church at Jerusalem? If the latter view is taken, the first interpretation (i.) becomes less probable than the second (ii.).

What tells further against (i.) is the probability that if such had been Paul's meaning, he would

<sup>1</sup> Professor Morgan's trenchant refutation of this hypothesis (pp. 213 f., 224 f.), which is enjoying a passing vogue in some quarters, agrees with Schweitzer and J. Réville in brushing aside the attempt to interpret 11<sup>29</sup> in the light of 10<sup>16</sup>, as if 'the body' were the divine nature identified with the loaf of which the worshippers ate. In Dr. P. T. Forsyth's *Church and the Sacraments* (p. 152), Professor H. T. Andrews pleads that 'honest exegesis' obliges us to adopt some such interpretation. 'Honest' is hardly the adequate epithet to be ear-marked for exegesis of this kind.



have written: 'For he who eats and drinks without discerning or discriminating the body *and the blood*, eats and drinks to his own condemnation.' In short, this interpretation is not adequate to the full meaning of *μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα*. At best, it suggests a starting-point for that meaning, and the content of *διακρίνειν τὸ σῶμα* requires to be filled out from the context, especially from what has been said about *ἀναξίως* ('unworthily') and *δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτόν* ('let every man examine himself' = v. 31). Now these phrases suit (ii.) exactly. 'Αναξίως denotes the frame of mind which does not trouble to put itself into line with the object of Christ in the Supper. To partake 'unworthily' (*ἀναξίως*) is to partake without any due recollection or perception of the death and passion which the rite commemorates. This is of course irreverent; it is to eat the bread and drink the wine as if they meant nothing special. But the irreverence consists in the irrelevance of the communicant to the feast. 'Αναξίως is 'carelessly,' 'heedlessly,' not 'unworthily.' And this is what the next phrase about 'testing oneself' implies. 'Let a man test himself; then he can eat from the loaf and drink from the cup.' Let him make sure that he knows what he is doing, let him realize his position, as one for whom the Lord died, as a member of the community, of the Body of Christ. The best preparation for partaking in the Supper, Paul implies, is a realization of the infinite obligations we are under to Christ and to one another.

I say, 'to Christ and to one another,'<sup>1</sup> because, although the second (ii.) interpretation is preferable, it is quite unnecessary to narrow the meaning of *μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα*. Both (a) and (b) are required to round off its significance. On the one hand, *τὸ σῶμα* must retain some of the suggestiveness of vv. 28-29. 'The Lord Jesus took a loaf . . . saying, This loaf means my body (*τὸ σῶμα*) broken for you. . . . As often as you eat this loaf . . . you proclaim the Lord's death . . . he who eats the loaf carelessly . . . will have to answer for a sin against the body (*τοῦ σώματος*) of the Lord.' It is to this sacrificial significance of the Supper

that Paul is recalling the Corinthians. When he adds, 'for he who eats and drinks (*μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα*), eats and drinks to his own doom,' *τὸ σῶμα* is a compact expression for the foregoing 'body and blood'; to eat the loaf without reflecting what it means in the Eucharist is fatal, that is Paul's point. If there is not a blessing in it, there is a curse, and the blessing depends upon the reverent appreciation of the Supper as commemorating the Death.

Or rather, it is Paul's primary point, we should say. As we have seen, the turn of thought and expression in 10<sup>16</sup>, 17 proves that *τὸ σῶμα* for Paul in this connexion carried the further sense of unity with the Lord. When he speaks of the Church participating in the body of Christ, as the loaf is broken and eaten at the Eucharist, he can instantly think of the Church itself as the Body of Christ. The mystical, imaginative expression calls up both truths together. For the object and end of Christ's sacrificial death is reconciliation to one another, through reconciliation to God; the essential meaning of the Eucharist, as of the sacrifice which it represents, is in one aspect the common fellowship of those who are 'in the Lord' (*ἐν κυρίῳ*). The love-feast, with which the Supper was conjoined at Corinth, was intended to express the common life of Christians as the Body of the Lord, and this is close to Paul's mind in 1 Co 11<sup>17-34</sup>. He begins with it and ends with it. What he denounced as utterly incompatible with any proper observance of a 'Lord's' Supper (*κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*) was the selfish individualism which the Corinthians showed: *ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει* (vv. 20, 21), 'for every one takes his own supper.' He is about to deal with this in chap. 12, where the conception of the Body and its members is developed, in order to prove the weakness and absurdity of this *ἕκαστος* individualism. But already, in discussing the Supper, he has it in mind. And when he closes by telling the Corinthians to wait for one another at their church gatherings, instead of disregarding their fellow-members (vv. 33, 34), he is reiterating a counsel which he had already suggested in *μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα*.

It is therefore unnecessary to confine the meaning of *μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα* either to (a) or to (b) of the second interpretation. Neither in view of 10<sup>16</sup>, nor in the light of 11<sup>17</sup>, can we say, with Professor Morgan (*op. cit.* p. 226), that the Lord's Supper meant 'a memorial of Christ's sacrificial

<sup>1</sup> Calvin (on 1 Co 11<sup>20</sup>) recognizes this explicitly. 'Vides expeditissimam methodum. Si rite vis uti Christi beneficio, fidem afferas et poenitentiam: in his ergo duobus constitit examen, ut venias bene preparatus. Sub poenitentia charitatem includo: nam qui sibi renuntiare didicit, ut se Christo eiusque obsequio addicat, ille etiam procul dubio unitatem a Christo commendatam ex animo colet.'



death—that and that alone’ to Paul, still less that ‘the conception of the rite as binding believers into a fellowship with one another never emerges’ (p. 221). Mr. Srawley is right in arguing that, while the primary reference of τὸ σῶμα in v.<sup>29</sup> is to the ‘body’ (cf. v.<sup>24</sup>), ‘it is possible’—I would put it more strongly, it is highly probable—that he has in view the more inclusive sense of “body” referred to in 1 Co 10<sup>16, 17</sup>. By his selfish action the richer brother failed to recognize that the

sacred meal was a fellowship of believers with Christ and with one another. It was the sacrament of their incorporation in Christ. The abuses at Corinth turned it into a private meal’ (*Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, v. 543b). Hence the deliberate choice of τὸ σῶμα in 11<sup>29</sup>, not simply because it summed up concisely the idea of ‘the body and the blood’ (the body suffering death by the shedding of blood), but also because it called up the idea of the Body of Christ as the Church.

## Literature.

### THE CRITIQUE OF PURE REASON.

DR. NORMAN KEMP SMITH, McCosh Professor of Philosophy in Princeton University, has written *A Commentary to Kant's 'Critique of Pure Reason'* (Macmillan; 21s. net). In theology a distinction is made between a Commentary and an Exposition, the former being an explanation of the author's words and phrases, with only an incidental reference to his thought; the latter being an explanation of his thought, with only an occasional reference to his phraseology. Dr. Kemp Smith's Commentary is an Exposition.

Few books that have been written require a Commentary (we keep Dr. Kemp Smith's word) more than Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*. For it is not merely defective in clearness or popularity of expression. ‘That,’ as Professor Kemp Smith says, ‘is a common failing of metaphysical treatises, especially when they are in the German language, and might pass without special remark. What is much more serious is that Kant flatly contradicts himself in almost every chapter, and that there is hardly a technical term which is not employed by him in a variety of different and conflicting senses. As a writer, he is the least exact of all the great thinkers.’

What is the explanation? The explanation is that the *Critique* was written in portions during a period of eight years, and at the end of that period (1780) the portions were run together into one treatise within the space of five months. Even the piecing together of these manuscripts was done under such disadvantages as made coherence an impossibility. For Kant objected to the sacrifice

of an argument if once it had been committed to writing. ‘If it could be inserted, no matter at what cost of repetition, or even confusion, he insisted upon its insertion.’

Here is room enough for inconsistency. But there is more. Kant's supreme merit as a philosophical thinker, especially as shown in the first *Critique*, is his open-minded recognition of the complexity of his problems, and of the many difficulties which lie in the way of any solution which he is himself able to propound. Kant's method of working seems to have consisted in alternating between the various possible solutions, developing each in turn, in the hope that some midway position, which would share in the merits of all, might finally disclose itself. When, as frequently happened, such a midway solution could not be found, he developed his thought along the parallel lines of the alternative views.

Last of all comes the fact of more than one edition. Of the result Dr. Kemp Smith gives a striking example when he is dealing with Kant's refutation of idealism. ‘The new refutation of idealism in the second edition differs from that given in the fourth *Paralogism* of the first edition, not only in method of argument, but also in the nature of the conclusion which it seems to establish. Indeed it proves the *direct opposite* of what is asserted in the first edition. The earlier proof sought to show that, as regards immediacy of apprehension and subjectivity of existence, outer appearances stand on the same level as do our inner experiences. The proof of the second edition, on the other hand, argues that though outer appearances are immediately apprehended,



they must be existences distinct from the subjective states through which the mind represents them. The two arguments agree, indeed, in establishing immediacy, but as that which is taken as immediately known is in the one case a subjective state and in the other is an independent existence, the immediacy calls in the two cases for entirely different methods of proof. The first method consisted in viewing outer experiences as a subdivision within our inner experiences. The new method views their relation as not that of including and included, but of conditioning and conditioned; and it is now to outer experience that the primary position is assigned. So far is outer experience from being possible only as part of inner experience that on the contrary inner experience, consciousness of the flux of inner states, is only possible in and through experience of independent material bodies in space. A sentence from each proof will show how completely their conclusions are opposed: "Outer objects (bodies) are mere appearances, and are therefore nothing but a species of my representations, the objects of which are something only through these representations. Apart from them they are nothing." "Perception of this permanent is possible only through a *thing* outside me, and not through the mere *representation* of a thing outside me."

We have called Professor Kemp Smith's book an Exposition rather than a Commentary. Yet it begins with an explanation of words. And as that explanation is detachable, we shall refer to it as an example of his manner. It is the explanation of the title: *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, 'Critique of Pure Reason.'

1. 'The term critique or criticism, as employed by Kant, is of English origin. It appears in seventeenth and eighteenth century English, chiefly in adjectival form, as a literary and artistic term—for instance, in the works of Pope, who was Kant's favourite English poet. Kant was the first to employ it in German, extending it from the field of æsthetics to that of general philosophy. A reference in Kant's *Logic* to Home's *Elements of Criticism* would seem to indicate that it was Home's use of the term which suggested to him its wider employment. "Critique of pure reason," in its primary meaning, signifies the passing of critical judgments upon pure reason.'

2. 'Pure (*rein*) has here a very definite mean-

ing. It is the absolutely *a priori*. Negatively it signifies that which is independent of experience. Positively it signifies that which originates from reason itself, and which is characterised by universality and necessity. By "pure reason" Kant therefore means reason in so far as it supplies out of itself, independently of experience, *a priori* elements that as such are characterised by universality and necessity.'

3. 'Reason (*Vernunft*) is used in the *Critique* in three different meanings. In the title it is employed in its widest sense, as the source of all *a priori* elements. It includes what is *a priori* in sensibility as well as in understanding (*Verstand*). In its narrowest sense it is distinct even from understanding, and signifies that faculty which renders the mind dissatisfied with its ordinary and scientific knowledge, and which leads it to demand a completeness and unconditionedness which can never be found in the empirical sphere. Understanding conditions science; reason generates metaphysic. Understanding has categories; reason has its Ideas. Thirdly, Kant frequently employs understanding and reason as synonymous terms dividing the mind only into the two faculties, sensibility and spontaneity. The triple use of the term is an excellent example of the looseness and carelessness with which he employs even the most important and fundamental of his technical terms. Only the context can reveal the particular meaning to be assigned in each case.'

4. 'The phrase "of pure reason" (*der reinen Vernunft*) has, as Vaihinger points out, a threefold ambiguity. (1) Sometimes it is a genitive objective. The critical enquiry is directed upon pure reason as its object. This corresponds to the view of the *Critique* as merely a treatise on method. (2) Sometimes it is a genitive subjective. The critical enquiry is undertaken by and executed through pure reason. This expresses the view of the *Critique* as itself a system of pure rational knowledge. (3) At other times it has a reflexive meaning. Pure reason is subject and object at once. It is both subject-matter and method or instrument. Through the *Critique* it attains to self-knowledge. The *Critique* is the critical examination of pure reason by itself. The first view would seem to be the original and primary meaning of the title. The second view very early took its place alongside it, and appears in many passages. The third view must be taken as representing



# OLIPHANTS' NEW LIST

## Touching the Coming of the Lord

**3/6**  
NET  
Postage **4½d.**  
By C. F. HOGG and W. E. VINE, M.A.  
Joint Authors of 'The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians, with Notes, Exegetical and Expository,' &c.

## Made in the Pans

**3/6**  
NET  
Postage **4½d.**  
By AMY WILSON CARMICHAEL  
Author of 'Things as they are in Southern India,' &c.  
With a Foreword by the  
**BISHOP OF DURHAM**

Who says: 'I venture to call it a war-time volume. . . . Many poems are addressed, avowedly, and with a noble consolatory power to "War Sorrows," and others are prompted and animated by the experiences of another war not less formidable, a war of light with Satanic Darkness. . . . The book is full of quiet places of light and beauty.'

## Evolution Criticised

**3/6**  
NET  
Postage **5d.**  
By J. R. BISHOP  
Member of the Council of the Victoria Institute  
An able and exhaustive examination of the arguments for the evolution of man, which leaves the Christian reader better satisfied than ever with his belief in Divine creation.

A rich storehouse of facts for the student and teacher.

## What our Children Should Know And How we Should Tell Them

**4/6**  
NET  
Postage **4½d.**  
BY  
J. FLACK, L.R.C.P. and S. Edin. and S. Glos.  
Temporary Captain R.A.M.C.  
Diploma in Public Health, Manchester  
With a Foreword by  
**Sir ROBERT BADEN POWELL**

Who says: 'There is no form of education so attractive to the young of all ages and all spheres, so wide in its range, and so big and lasting in its moral, mental, and physical results as Nature study. It develops close observation, a keen interest in one's surroundings, an appreciation of beauty, and a rational understanding of biology and the sex question, and above all—the realisation of God the Creator.'

## Postman's Knock

**3/6**  
NET  
Postage **4½d.**  
Letters and Things for Girls and Boys  
By ROY OXENHAM  
With 26 clever illustrations by EDITH HARRIES  
and several Poems by JOHN OXENHAM

A book which is sure to be a favourite with girls and boys.

## An Alphabet of Stories

**3/6**  
NET  
Postage **4½d.**  
By Rev. W. J. MAY  
Here is something entirely new and very good indeed in the way of Sunday reading for young people. The pages are also brimful of suggestive hints for speakers, teachers, and parents, who will themselves greatly enjoy the book.

# Macmillan's New Books

## The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology.

The Bampton Lectures for 1915.  
By HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.LITT. (OXON.),  
D.C.L. (DUNELM), LL.D. (ST. ANDREWS); DEAN  
OF CARLISLE. 8vo. [Shortly.]

## Preparing the Way:

The Influence of Judaism of the Greek Period on the Earliest Development of Christianity.

By FRANK STREATFEILD, B.D. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

## A Study of Calvin, and other Papers.

By ALLAN MENZIES, D.D., late Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of St. Andrews. With a Memoir by his daughter. Preface by SIR HENRY JONES. With Portrait and Illustrations. 8vo, 10s. net.

*The Montrose Standard.*—'In its entirety, while the volume is highly creditable to all concerned in its preparation, it may also be taken to at once worthily commemorate a lifelong student and learner, an advanced thinker and teacher, and to mark a stage in the progress of theological thought in Scotland.'

## Faith and Freedom:

Being Constructive Essays in the Application of Modernist Principles to the Doctrine of the Church.

By ALFRED FAWKES, CHAS. E. RAVEN, HAROLD ANSON, W. SCOTT PALMER, A. CLUTTON-BROCK, WINIFRED MERCIER, and CHARLES H. S. MATTHEWS (EDITOR). Crown 8vo, 6s. net.

*The Glasgow Herald.*—'The book reveals throughout a temper of reasonableness and charity which will appeal to those who understand the need for fresh thinking on the great themes of the Christian faith.'

## The Religion of the Beatitudes.

A Study of Christ's Teaching based on Addresses delivered at the Church of All Hallows, Lombard Street, during Lent, 1917.

By the REV. MINOS DEVINE, M.A., Author of 'Ecclesiastes'; or, The Confessions of an Adventurous Soul.' Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

\*\*\* This is a devotional and literary treatment of the Beatitudes. It is an endeavour to enforce their teaching by illustrations from history, biography, and literature.

## The Gospel of the Cross.

Written after a Conference of the Swanwick Free Church Fellowship by J. R. COATES, C. H. DODD, W. F. HALLIDAY, MALCOLM SPENCER, and OLIVE WYON. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

*The Church Family Newspaper.*—'A spirit of very real devotion breathes through this valuable little work, which cannot fail to be helpful to many a reader.'

### NEW EDITION.

## Modern Religious Movements in India.

By J. N. FARQUHAR, M.A., D.LITT. Illustrated. 8vo, 12s. 6d. net.

*The East and the West.*—'The book is an important contribution to literature on the subject with which it deals, and should be of great service to missionaries and to all who desire to understand the recent religious developments which have taken place in India.'

\*\*\* Macmillan's Autumn Announcement List post free on application.

**MACMILLAN & CO., LTD., LONDON, W.C. 2.**

**OLIPHANTS LTD.,** 75 PRINCES STREET, EDINBURGH.  
21 PATERNOSTER SQUARE, LONDON, E.C. 4.

# Oxford University Press.

## Legends of Babylon and Egypt.

By L. W. KING.

The Schweich Lecture for 1916. Medium 8vo, 3s. net.

## 'Righteousness' in the Gospels.

By the Rev. E. A. ABBOTT.

Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. VIII.

Royal 8vo, 1s. net.

## The Idea of God in the Light of Recent Research.

The Gifford Lectures in the University of  
Aberdeen, 1912-13.

By A. S. PRINGLE-PATTISON.

8vo, 12s. 6d. net.

## Treasures of the Magi.

A Study of Modern Zoroastrianism.

By JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Medium 8vo, 8s. 6d. net.

[*Religious Quest of India Series.*]

## Indian Painting.

By PERCY BROWN.

A new volume in the 'Heritage of India' Series. Edited  
by J. N. FARQUHAR (Literary Secretary, National  
Y.M.C.A. Council, India and Ceylon), and H. D.  
GRISWOLD. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

## The Encyclopædia Sinica.

By SAMUEL COULING.

The first attempt made to cover in a book of reference  
all Chinese matters, useful to the Student of Chinese  
things or the Resident in China.

Imperial 8vo, £2. 2s. net.

*International Review of Missions.*—'It is a book which every  
one who has to do with China should hasten to procure.'

## The Table Talk and Omnia of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.

With a Note on Coleridge by COVENTRY  
PATMORE.

Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

London: HUMPHREY MILFORD,  
Oxford University Press, Amen Corner, E.C.4.

Published by T. & T. CLARK.

## The World to Come and Final Destiny

(The Kerr Lectures, 1917-18)

By J. H. LECKIE, D.D.

The author studies his subject from the historical  
standpoint. He argues therefrom that the apoca-  
lyptic element in religious faith is of permanent  
meaning and value. This leads to a consideration  
of the theories of ultimate destiny.

NOW READY.

Price 10s. net (postage 6d.)

'THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.'

**WANTED**

**VOL. XVI., PART I. (OCTOBER)**

Communicate with T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE  
STREET, EDINBURGH, and state price required.

## H. R. ALLENSON'S BOOKS.

**MR. ALEXANDER'S FIRST BOOK.**

**THE GLORY IN THE GREY.** 42 Papers on Everyday  
Life and Religion.

By the Rev. ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER, M.A., B.D.  
SIXTH EDITION. 5s. NET. SIXTH EDITION.

GLASGOW HERALD.—'This is a book of hope, a tonic for the  
dejected and dispirited. The author has very successfully concentrated  
his attention on his task, that of drawing out the elements of glory, of  
purpose, from the grey experience of life. Obviously the man who can  
do this has a peculiarly suitable message for the present day: this  
one could scarcely be sent out more opportunely. This book is  
sure of success.'

Dr. Geo. H. Morrison on THE GLORY IN THE GREY.

Dr. GEO. H. MORRISON writes: 'I cannot refrain from writing to  
congratulate you on the book. Its freshness, variety, suggestiveness, and  
poetry have fascinated me. It seems to me one of the best things I have  
read for years. All success to it. I have found it a little haven of rest in  
these troublous times.'

Rev. Dr. Alexander Smellie on THE GLORY IN THE GREY.

Rev. Dr. ALEXANDER SMELLIE writes: 'It is delightful. Its wise,  
gracious, simple, yet strong, Christian teaching has brought me genuine  
help and will be a rich benefit to every reader.'

**MR. ALEXANDER'S SECOND BOOK.**

**A DAY AT A TIME.** Talks on Life and Religion. By the  
Rev. ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER,  
M.A., B.D.

THIRD EDITION. 3s. 6d. NET. THIRD EDITION.

Dr. John Kelman on A DAY AT A TIME.

Rev. JOHN KELMAN, D.D., writes: 'I find it everywhere an ex-  
cellently timely and helpful volume. Its common sense, good humour,  
and genuine humanness of outlook and of expression are very refreshing  
and wholesome. It is the sort of book which is needed during these  
dark days by large numbers of people, and it will do real service  
to the spirit of the nation.'

Dr. John A. Hutton on A DAY AT A TIME.

Rev. JOHN A. HUTTON, D.D., writes: 'It is a book which should  
find many friends in days like these through which we are passing, when  
sensitive people are grateful for the honourable interpretation of life.'

PLEASE WRITE FOR OUR NEW CATALOGUE, 16 PAGES, POST FREE.  
LONDON: H. R. ALLENSON LTD., RACQUET COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.



Kant's final interpretation of the title; it is on the whole the most adequate to the actual content and scope of the *Critique*. For the *Critique* is not merely a treatise on method; it is also a system of pure rational knowledge. It professes to establish, in an exhaustive and final manner, the *a priori* principles which determine the possibility, conditions, and limits of pure rational knowledge.'

It is enough to add that Professor Kemp Smith has a command of the English language no less complete and easeful than is his command of the book to which he has written this commentary. Sometimes his language glows with the emotion of a religious rather than of a philosophical writer (but never so as to unbalance his judgment). One short paragraph may be offered in illustration.

'When Voltaire in his *Ignorant Philosopher* remarks that "it would be very singular that all nature, all the planets, should obey eternal laws, and that there should be a little animal, five feet high, who, in contempt of these laws, could act as he pleased, solely according to his caprice," he is forgetting that this same animal of five feet can contain the stellar universe in thought within himself, and has therefore a dignity which is not expressible in any such terms as his size may seem, for vulgar estimation, to imply. Man, though dependent upon the body and confined to one planet, has the sun and stars as the playthings of his mind. Though finite in his mortal conditions, he is divinely infinite in his powers.'

### THE LITERATURE OF AMERICA.

'The Cambridge History of English Literature' is finished; *A History of American Literature* is begun. It is to be edited and written by Americans. It will be divided into three books, and completed in three volumes. The first volume (Cambridge: At the University Press; 15s. net) ends with Emerson.

What is the fascination of the literature of America? Its leisure and its friendliness. Even in this volume, though it has so much ground to cover in so short a time, there is ample time to do all that has to be done, and a little loitering by the way is in the plan. Did you ever hear of Joseph Dennie? No doubt, if you have felt the fascination—if you had the good fortune, for instance, to read in your youth Field's 'Yesterdays with Authors.' But if not, if you are only a well-

educated Briton, you have probably never heard of Joseph Dennie. He has two pages and a half all to himself, and the whole atmosphere is of a lazy afternoon in the 'Fall' somewhere within reach of Harvard. Dennie 'was as fond of conviviality as Steele, and as elegant in dress as Goldsmith. His literary pose had little in common with his actual habits of composition, as described by a former printer's devil of *The Farmer's Museum* :

'One of the best of his Lay Sermons was written at the village tavern, directly opposite to the office, in a chamber where he and his friends were amusing themselves with cards. It was delivered to me by piece-meal, at four or five different times. If he happened to be engaged in a game, when I applied for copy, he would ask some one to play his hand for him, while he could "give the devil his due." When I called for the closing paragraph of the sermon, he said, "Call again in five minutes." "No," said Tyler, "I'll write the improvement for you." He accordingly wrote the concluding paragraph, and Dennie never saw it till it was in print.'

They could do those things even with sermons there and then, and they can be recorded so delightfully here and now. The History of American Literature is at least to be readable. It is also to be accurate. The bibliographical lists are a wonder of fulness and correctness. And the characterizations of a period or a tendency are thoroughly reliable. This for example of New England Transcendentalism :

'According to this view of the world, the one reality is the vast spiritual background of existence, the Over-Soul, God, within which all other being is unified, and from which it derives its life. Because of this indwelling of divinity, every part of the world, however small, is a microcosm, comprehending within itself, like Tennyson's flower in the crannied wall, all the laws and meaning of the whole. The soul of each individual, therefore, is identical with the soul of the world, and contains, latently, all that that larger soul contains. Thus the normal life of man is a life of continuous expansion, the making actual of the potential elements of his being. This may occur in two ways: either directly, in states which vary from the ordinary perception of truth to moments of mystical rapture in which there is a conscious influx of the divine into the human; or indirectly, through the instrumentality of nature. Nature is the embodi-

ment of spirit in the world of sense—it is a great picture to be appreciated, a great book to be read, a great task to be performed. Through the beauty, truth, and goodness incarnate in the natural world, the individual soul comes in contact with and appropriates to itself the spirit and being of God.'

Who is the greatest of all the writers of America? That also is answered here: 'It becomes more and more apparent that Emerson, judged by an international or even by a broad national standard, is the outstanding figure of American letters. Others may have surpassed him in artistic sensitiveness, or, to a criticism averse to the stricter canons of form and taste, may seem to be more original or more broadly national than he, but as a steady force in the transmutation of life into ideas and as an authority in the direction of life itself he has obtained a recognition such as no other of his countrymen can claim. And he owes this pre-eminence not only to his personal endowment of genius, but to the fact also that, as the most perfect exponent of a transient experiment in civilization, he stands for something that the world is not likely to let die.'

#### PROTESTANTISM IN GERMANY.

One of the surprises of the war has been the impotence of the Russian Church. But there was an earlier surprise than that. It was the subservience of the Lutheran Church in Germany. No one has come to tell us clearly why the Church in Russia had so little power in the evil day. And only now has one come, at once competent and outspoken, to tell us how it came to pass that the Lutheran Church did not lift up its voice against the breaking of treaties and the crushing of liberties, but, on the contrary, gloried in the one and scoffed at the other. It is Dr. Kerr D. Macmillan, President of Wells College, U.S.A.

In his book *Protestantism in Germany* (Oxford University Press; 6s. 6d. net), Dr. Macmillan traces the history of the relation of the State to the Church from the beginning of the Reformation until now. He shows how decidedly Luther laid down the principle of the universal priesthood of all believers, and how desirous he was that the affairs of the Church should be administered by those who were members of it. But he shows also that Luther found the members of the Church unable of themselves to administer its affairs, so

gross was their ignorance and so low their ideals. So it was out of necessity, as he sorrowfully said, that he turned 'to the civil authority because "it is the duty of all of us, but especially of the secular authority, above all things [*für allen Dingen*]', to educate the poor children that are daily being born and always growing, and to hold them to the fear of God and discipline, for which schools and preachers and pastors are necessary. If the older people will not have it, let them continue to go to the devil. But the secular authority is at fault if the youth are neglected and undisciplined."

Luther and his great associates passed away. The generation following quarrelled over matters of dogma, and the civil ruler was called in on every occasion. Then came the firm establishment of the Territorial System. And now the very principle of the universal priesthood is confined to the sphere of religion, and the State defines how narrow and impotent that sphere is. Listen to Rieker in the latest edition of Herzog: 'The Protestant principle of the universal priesthood is a religious and not a constitutional principle. It has reference to the relation of a Christian to God, and not to his position in the legal organism of the church.'

So the State is the lord and the Church is the servant. And when the State chooses to go to war, the Church finds reasons why God should go with it. 'From the time of the Reformation until the present there have not been lacking in Germany many pastors in every generation that have stood fearlessly for what they considered pure doctrine and true morality, and by their learning and life endeared themselves to their parishioners, and put the Christian world in their debt. From the homes of Lutheran ministers, as from the Scottish manse and our own ministers' homes, have gone out sons and daughters whose influence has been so great and good in every department of social life, as well as in the church, that no one can doubt the seriousness, piety, and sound discipline that surrounded their childhood. Moreover, owing to this constancy of the pastors, there has been a steady though not uninterrupted advance throughout the centuries, so that it may be said that the position of the pastor and of the church as a whole was never so favourable or secure as to-day. But the struggle upward has been long and arduous, much more so than might have been the case had it not been for the oppressive hand of the



state and the lack of independence in the church. The Protestant church in Germany, by being deprived of the form of organization and the self-government compatible with its principles, has never been free to control its ministers, to train its people, or to play its proper part in educating, disciplining and directing the thought of the nation. The evil effects of the territorial system are written plainly in every page of its history.'

### ALLAN MENZIES.

Messrs. Macmillan have issued a volume which contains the most important of the occasional papers written by the late Professor Allan Menzies of St. Andrews. The title is *A Study of Calvin, and Other Papers* (10s. net). That which gives the volume its title is a paper of more than a hundred and twenty pages in length. It is just such an estimate of Calvin and Calvinism as the present time needs, and yet it is so free from temporary judgments that it is sure to last through many trying times to come. The English ignorance of Calvin and of his thought is disgraceful, the most damaging thing for contemporary theological training that we know. And the result of that ignorance is disastrous. His value as a commentator is ignored, though he is of more value than any other of those who wrote before the scientific criticism of the Bible began. Professor Menzies was of the most liberal school of theology in Scotland and so not born to be a Calvinist. But he had studied Calvin. 'He is a great man and his views are wide, and he has a great knowledge of literature. He has a happy insight into the nature of the book he takes up, and his tendency to edification keeps him free on the whole from exaggeration and absurdities. He declines in some instances to accept the plain meaning of a passage which will not fit into his system, but that is rare. He does not go into long digressions; his motto as an interpreter is "lucid brevity."'

Of the remaining papers we are most attracted by that on the Preparation of the Apostle Paul at Tarsus. Paul, says his daughter, was always one of Dr. Menzies' heroes. 'The more he worked at the history of St. Paul, the more he was fascinated by the grandeur of his character, the power and effectiveness of his life.' The very last day of his own life he worked all day long on his article on 'Paul' for THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS.

'It was a wet, blustering day, and he only went down to the gate to look at the waves. After dinner he came and played with his dog, a Dandie Dinmont of affectionate ways, who looked forward to the usual programme from his master every night, that his paws should be tickled and his tail gently pulled. Good-night was said as usual, and about eleven o'clock my Father went up to rest. Shortly afterwards he became breathless, and in a few seconds he was gone—awakening on the Sabbath morning to the fuller life.'

Those sentences are from the Memoir which his daughter has written to introduce the Papers. It is right well done that Memoir, a quiet conscientious faithful story and lifelike portrait. Clearly Professor Menzies was and is a man to be envied.

There is a delightful anecdote of pastoral visitation. It is an epitome of the two extremes once at war in Scotland, the 'moderate' and the 'high-flying,' and it is a rebuke to both. Menzies visited 'an old woman who was addicted to the pleasures of a cutty pipe. He went in, and perceiving the smell of tobacco, said to her in his friendly way, "Well, Janet, been having a draw?" She made no reply, and for the whole of his visit she remained dumb. Shortly after he had gone, another minister called. He adopted a more serious tone, and inquired in a voice of deep solemnity, "Well, Janet, how is it with your soul to-day?" But this question pleased her no better than the last. She made no reply, but when her visitor had gone, she turned indignantly to her niece, who kept house for her, and said, "Twa impident rascals thae!"'

### THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH.

Mr. David Baron has written much on prophecy and typology. Being invited, on the strength of these writings, to contribute Notes on Zechariah to *The Scattered Nation*, the Quarterly Record of the Hebrew Christian Testimony to Israel, he persevered with his task through many issues, and now the Notes are published in a large handsome volume of 554 octavo pages under the title of *The Visions and Prophecies of Zechariah* (Morgan & Scott; 10s. 6d. net).

Those who are out of sympathy with Mr. Baron's principles of interpretation will be apt to overlook the book. That will be a mistake. The author speaks for a devoted band of men and

women whose outlook has to be understood. It is very true that modern scholars will have nothing to do with the secondary sense which he finds so frequently and so assuredly in the prophet's language. Still less will they accept the interpretation which makes the prophet o'erleap the centuries and see the day of Christ in every detail of its unfolding. But that is the method of interpreting Scripture which alone seems to give it value for spiritual nourishment and growth in grace to a certain number of believers in our day. It is therefore impossible to deny wholly its divine instrumentality. There is no doubt, however, that this commentary on Zechariah makes its chief appeal to those who are in sympathy with its author's conception of God's providence and His method of revelation.

A short example may be given of Mr. Baron's exposition. Let it be part of the note on the phrase, 'Behold the man' in Zec 6<sup>12</sup>: 'Ecce Homo'!—"Behold the Man!"—an expression which has become famous and of profound significance, since some five centuries later, in the overruling providence of God, it was used by Pilate on the day when He Who came to bring life into the world was Himself led forth to a death of shame.

'Here, however, it is not to the Son of Man in His humiliation, to the "Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief," that our attention is directed by God Himself, but to the only true Man after God's own heart—the Man *par excellence*—the Ideal and Representative of the race, Who, after having for our salvation worn the crown of thorns, shall, as the reward of His sufferings, be "crowned with glory and honour," and have all things put in subjection under His feet.'

### THE FACE OF CHRIST.

In *The Quest of the Face* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net) the author (let us say it is the author) sets out to find the face of Christ among the citizens of London. As the author is Mr. Stephen Graham, we know that we shall have good writing and reverence, and may accompany him with expectation. But how does he know the face of Christ? How will he recognize it? He has looked at the face of Christ as the great painters have painted it and he is not satisfied with it. He is not satisfied with any of the faces. If, however, the faces

could all be gathered into one he believes *the* face would be found. For each picture has something that is satisfying though none has everything. Even if two were brought into one, the ancient painting of Ushakop and the very modern painting of Vasnetsov (both Russian paintings, you observe), we should be very near the picture of the true face. In any case the author, as he sets out on his quest, has a face in his mind's eye, and he hopes to find it in London.

But he is disappointed. The nearest approach to it is the face of a man who is dead. He has fallen down in the street; a crowd gathers; the author looks down on the face also, and behold it is almost the face that he is seeking. But the man is dead. The face of Christ is the face of the living.

Then a wonderful Serbian comes, a scholar, thinker, enthusiast, Christian. And they go out together to find the face, more hopefully now and further away. Dushan, the Serbian, shows him that he has been seeking an individual; they must seek a member of society. They must find the Kingdom of God first, and then within the Kingdom they will find the face. They find the Kingdom, and the quest comes to an end. For the face of Christ is not to be found until one awakes.

But why not? Why is it not found when you have found a Christian nation? Why is the face not to be found, say, in America? Because 'America comes laden with the sadness of the plight of the black man, her ten millions of liberated slaves, many of whom will also have shed their blood and mingled it in death with the blood of whites for the same cause. She comes laden also with enmity toward the yellow man, and is predisposed to settle a dispute with Japan by the same anachronistic force of arms and appeal for justice and right. She will not readily give to Japan over and above what Japan wants in the West, and so win more goodwill in the grand commonality of humanity. But if America comes thus encumbered, we come to her not less so. We English have India on our conscience, and the denial of the brotherhood of the most wonderful peoples of the East. India has mingled her blood with ours also on the field of death for the same ideals; it is for us to meet her now with love and sacrifice and the convincing reality of our religion. And in Africa it must no longer be possible to reproach us, as King Cetewayo said: "First come



missionary, then come rum, then come trader, then come soldiers"—nor for the soldier to yearn to be shipped east of Suez that he may raise a thirst for sin.'

There are other things in the book besides the Quest of the Face. But the Quest of the Face is the main thing.

### DEUTERONOMY.

What was the Book of the Covenant which in the time of Josiah was found in the Temple, was read to the king and then to the people, and caused such consternation? Sir George Adam Smith says it was some form of Deuteronomy. But what form he cannot say. For there were many books and editions of books out of which our present Book of Deuteronomy was compiled, 'and we cannot say which of these this Law-Book was or whether it was exactly any one of them, or whether the process of their compilation had already begun.' In 1903 Dr. John Cullen published his *Book of the Covenant in Moab* in which he argued that the book found by Hilkiah contained not the code of laws of the present Deuteronomy but its discourses or some of them. Sir G. A. Smith examines Dr. Cullen ('one of the most original and searching of recent works on the subject') and concludes: 'While Dr. Cullen presents an unanswerable case for the inclusion in Josiah's Law-Book of considerable sections of the deuteronomic discourses, and especially of chs. v.-xi., he fails to prove that the book did not also contain some at least of the Code.'

Sir George Adam Smith has written the Commentary on *The Book of Deuteronomy* for the Cambridge Bible in the Revised Version (Cambridge Press; 6s. 6d. net). The Introduction and the Notes are both very full and very scholarly: they are also very readable. We have looked at the Introduction. Let us look at the Notes. On the verse (Dt 23<sup>25</sup>), 'When thou comest into thy neighbour's standing corn, then thou mayest pluck the ears with thine hand; but thou shalt not move a sickle unto thy neighbour's standing corn,' we read: 'The Pharisees flagrantly contradicted not only the spirit of this law, but its very letter, by interpreting *plucking* as *reaping*, and because this was *work* (v.<sup>18</sup>) they held it unlawful on the Sabbath.'

On the leaving of a sheaf in the harvest field

(Dt 24<sup>19</sup>) we read: 'Attention has been drawn to the fact that some peoples leave the last sheaf on the field under the superstition that it contains the corn-spirit, and being therefore dangerous is easily relinquished to strangers (Frazer, *Golden Bough*, ii. 171 f., 232 f.). I am told that in the shires of Lincoln and Norfolk it was the practice till sixty or eighty years ago to shape part of a sheaf into a "corn-baby" and to bury it in the field, in order to ensure the next crop. It is possible that in some cases the custom of leaving the gleanings to the poor may have started from such superstitions. But those who see in these the sole origin of the custom ignore the natural promptings of the hearts of simple, peasant peoples to care for the needy. There are no traces of the superstition in D, H, or Ruth ii. D's appeal to the self-interest of the harvesters (*that thy God may bless thee*, etc.) is rather one of his many illustrations of his favourite principle that obedience to God's ethical demands will be rewarded by prosperity (cp. xiv. 29, xv. 4 f., 10, 18, xxiii. 20; cp. xvii. 20). Otherwise the motives of the laws are purely humane and in both sets the humanity is enforced by religious considerations. In D the motive is characteristically gratitude to God (v. 22), in H it is as characteristically the simple fact: *I am Jehovah thy God*.—The duties enforced are observed at this day in Palestine. "The poorest among the people, the widow and the orphan, are not infrequently seen following the reapers"; and "the poor are often seen after the gathering in of the crop going from tree to tree and collecting the few olives that may have been left" (Van Lennep, *Bible Lands*, etc., 78, 128). "It is natural with them not to gather stray ears or to cut all the standing ones, which would be looked upon as avarice; every bad act is avoided as much as possible "before the blessing," as the corn is very often called; the law of Moses . . . is innate with them. The produce of the gleanings . . . may enable a widow to have bread enough for the winter' (Baldensperger, *P.E.F.Q.*, 1907, 19).

### SAINTE CHANTAL.

*Sainte Chantal, 1572-1641: A Study in Vocation*, by E. K. Sanders (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net)—such is the title-page of the latest issue of the S.P.C.K. series of Ecclesiastical Biographies.

It is a most minute and elaborate biography.

The style is not easy. There is a way of anticipating the future (which is no doubt clear enough to the author) that is bewildering. And there is a way of returning upon events that are past which is occasionally almost as disconcerting. Yet the study is most interesting. One has to take time. The second time the whole book is read will make everything clear and establish its real value.

Baronne de Chantal is known as the intimate friend of François de Sales, and as the Founder and first Superior of the Order of the Visitation. But it is not the outward events of her life that are of importance here, it is her own religious development. What a curious experience it is. Through what a series of doubts and difficulties did she pass, always directed by the wise counsel of François de Sales. It is something to reach sainthood; and no doubt it was sainthood that she reached at last. But the road travelled was surely a mistaken one. Life has sorrows enough for self-discipline; we do not need to go out of the way, seeking mortifying experiences at every turning.

And the life in the Order is not, as we see it here, an attractive one. At Lyons, where a branch of the Order was established (its first Foundation was at Annecy), a certain M. Austrain had been helpful, and his child Christine was received into the House. She was not a 'religious' and did not want to be. The report sent to the Mother Superior is: 'The child's inclinations become daily more impossible to check. It is really appalling to hear the things she says, my daughter de Thorens is completely astonished. She says she cannot live here any longer, that no one talks of anything but God, and she gets so tired of it that sometimes she feels completely desperate. I have had to beat her myself to-day and shall have to do so again; we must just do the best we can while she remains here.' Our sympathy is entirely with the child.

### ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

There were ancient critics as there are modern. The ancient criticised dates and documents as they were able. The modern can do no more. Perhaps we give too much credence to the modern critics. Mr. G. H. Trench trusts solely the ancient. Whatever has the mark of tradition on it, that he accepts. He has no introduction to his commentary on the Fourth Gospel, which goes

by the title of *A Study of St. John's Gospel* (Murray; 7s. 6d. net). He accepts the Johannine authorship—'such is the tradition of the Church throughout the centuries'—and proceeds with his comments. He believes that there was a Pre-Adamic race—'the Bible deals with none but Adam's race, the type that began about 6000 years B.C.' He finds salvation for all of that race which entered and left the world throughout those 6000 years in the descent of Christ into Hades. 'We may believe that there is a vast organized Ministry working in the underworld started by our Lord Himself when "He descended into Hades."' He believes that Jesus baptized His mother, His reputed father, and also John the Baptist. He accepts the tradition that Golgotha got its name from Adam's skull, and seems to believe that Adam was buried there. Finally, he believes that all (men and things) shall yet be brought home to God. This is the Note there:

'John 6<sup>37</sup>, "All, which The Father gives to Me, shall get home to Me." The totality of the race is given and shall reach Him its goal: it is The Father's gift to Him: "and no individual that is on the way to Me will I cast out." No argument can be found here against the Universalists—their position being that while the whole human race has been given by The Father to The Son, the individuals get home to Him at long intervals reaching over various Ages.'

Mr. Francis Meynell has made a selection from Henry Vaughan and Andrew Marvell and has published it, very attractively, with the title *The Best of Both Worlds* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. net). How well does Vaughan express the mind of many at this time in the familiar verse:

He that hath found some fledged bird's nest  
may know

At first sight if the bird be flown;  
But what fair well or grove he sings in now,  
That is to him unknown.

Professor Gilbert Murray delivered the Presidential Address to the Classical Association in January. His subject was the Religion of a 'Man of Letters.' He has published the address, with the appropriate title of *Religio Grammatici* (Allen & Unwin; 1s. net). What is the Religion of this



Man of Letters? It is the religion of Democracy. 'For the cardinal doctrine of that religion is the right of every human soul to enter, unhindered except by the limitation of its own powers and desires, into the full spiritual heritage of the race.' Thus Professor Murray uses the word religion with comprehensiveness—for even the word 'spiritual' in that definition is more applicable to Shelley than it would be to Wordsworth.

*The Helping Hand*, by Gerald Gould (Allen & Unwin; 2s. net), is held out to the sinner. And there is some courage in the way the offer is made. 'Let us then [this is in the chapter on Sin] come straight, and with full courage, to the fact which we all know in our heart of hearts, and all constantly forget: the fact which is the solution, if rightly understood, of many among the paradoxes and contradictions which have beset our inquiry so far: the fact which is the beginning of hope for the outcast and the unhappy, and the first step towards true religion. The fact is this: a sin is not to the bad *if we are resolved to turn it into good*. A sin may be full of hope, of promise; it may be the cause and inspiration of a new way of life.' That paragraph is decisive for the understanding of the book.

Mr. Blackwell of Oxford has issued a revised edition of that most entertaining Commentary on the Georgics of Virgil by the Rev. T. F. Royds, M.A., B.D., entitled *The Beasts, Birds, and Bees of Virgil* (4s. 6d. net). In a delightful Preface, Mr. Warde Fowler says: 'No book of classical antiquity makes quite such a strong appeal to Englishmen as the *Georgics*. For the average educated Englishman has in him something of the sportsman, something of the naturalist, and often at the back of his mind an inkling of the poet; long ago he had also in him a good deal of the farmer, and it looks as though this might be so again in the next generation. The *Georgics*, if he has the luck to come across them, are pretty sure to attract him in one way or another. I well remember, in the days of my college tutorship, having to push a sporting youth through the thorny hedge of Responsions—one who was totally incapable of understanding the rhetoric of Livy, with whom we first tried him; then in despair I put him on the *Georgics*, and adroitly began with the third. When he came to Virgil's description of the horse's

points, his face and his mind at once brightened; to use his own language, he "found," and thereafter took all his fences without a fall.'

It will be a rare event in the future when a book appears which adds something substantial to the discussion of the Synoptic Problem. For the moment the centre of interest is Q—that unknown book (or something else) which is supposed to have been used by St. Matthew and St. Luke and which gave them the materials that their Gospels contain beyond the contents of St. Mark. And the urgent question is this: Did St. Luke and St. Matthew use Q independently?

Well, a book has been published by an American scholar, Professor George D. Castor (who lost his life in an accident in 1912), and is introduced to us by Professor B. W. Bacon, in which this latest aspect of the Synoptic Problem is discussed; and in our belief it is brought sensibly nearer a solution. This is the department of study in which the scholarship of America is fully abreast of the best learning in the world. And this book is of the best American scholarship. The title is *Matthew's Sayings of Jesus* (Cambridge University Press; \$1.25 net).

*The Book of Patriotism for Empire Day* is published by Messrs. Evans Brothers of Montague House, Russell Square, W.C. (2s. 6d. net). It is a large volume in strong wrappers and three columns to the page, containing more things about patriots and patriotism than you could have believed it possible to bring together within the covers of any single volume. There are hymns and songs and plays and recitations. There are rules for fancy marching and flag drill. There is an illustrated geography of the Empire and an illustrated description of its flags. There is Nature Study for Empire Day and there is Handwork for the same.

Mr. J. M. Hogge, M.A., M.P., has published two sermons on *Love Stronger than Death and the Consecration of Sacrifice* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. 6d. net), in order that he may do his part in holding up the weary hands and strengthening the feeble knees at this time. There is little of what is called 'sermon construction' about them, but there is much evidence of faith in God and sympathy with man.

*Christ and Woman* is the title of a book by F. W. Orde Ward, B.A. (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net), in which the Women are described who came in any way into touch with Christ, and something is said about what Christ did for them. It is a useful modern subject, a subject that will never lose its charm, and Mr. Orde Ward is by training and temperament the man to give the charm of it its full opportunity.

He puzzles us once. He seems to identify Mary Magdalene with the Woman in the City who was a sinner. It is an ancient error, and if the phrase 'damnable error' is ever allowable now, it is that. But Mr. Orde Ward is modern.

Herodias is one of the women. Did Christ come in contact with Herodias? We forget the words, 'His disciples went and told Jesus,' we forget how Jesus would realize the scene, the ghastly scene in the prison, and the ghastlier scene in the banqueting hall; and we forget that He would know the state of the soul of Herodias.

We must not think that the present glad rapprochement between this country and the United States is due entirely to the War. Let the War have its credit, it needs all it can obtain of every kind. But there were men who for years before the War broke out lived for this very purpose, and did not live in vain. One of them, and a most noble specimen, was Mr. John Lewis Griffiths, American Consul first at Liverpool and then at London. He had a personal charm which won every heart. And he could speak. Could there be a more perfect 'Vote of Thanks' than this to Mr. Birrell?—

'It is with unfeigned pleasure that I second the resolution of thanks, so feelingly and eloquently proposed by the Chairman. Many years ago I read *Obiter Dicta*. Since then I think I have read everything Mr. Birrell has written and many of his speeches. We have all fallen under the witchery of his style, so subtle in suggestion, so genial in humour, so searching and yet so kindly in satire, so profound in observation and comment, so pure in sentiment, so limpid and lucid in expression, so tender and humane in treating of the foibles and follies of men. He is a lineal descendant of Charles Lamb, dowered with the same rich gifts, and we go to his writings, however often the visit may be repeated, with the pleasurable anticipation with which we always go to the *Essays of Elia*,

knowing that they possess that perennial interest and charm, that elusive but unmistakable distinction of style, that nobility of diction, which characterize the literature that lives.

'Writing at a time when contemporary fame has often been sought by authors through the employment of the sensational, the weird and the grotesque, Mr. Birrell has always been true to the highest ethics of his art, choosing, for his handmaidens, beauty and truth. There is a benignity and serenity in his writings, which is as refreshing as the cool, tranquil spaces on a summer's day, in the deep recesses of the forest.

'It has been true of many English statesmen that they could write an epic or a sonnet, a romance or a dissertation on religion or philosophy, with the same ease and grace which they directed the affairs of empire. It has fallen to few statesmen, however, to do what Mr. Birrell has done, to infuse their contributions to political debate with such a charming literary quality as to cause their words to be listened to and read by men of opposing party faith with the keenest delight. His utterances are always relieved by the wit that stimulates, and mellowed and ennobled by the gentleness that heals. You are as well known and as greatly beloved, Mr. Birrell, in my country as in your own land, and I bear to you to-night the homage of kinsmen beyond the sea. Your gift to English letters will prove a precious legacy to all who enjoy the delicate and exquisite musings of rare and cultured souls.'

Mr. Griffiths' speeches and lectures have been published under the title of *The Greater Patriotism* (John Lane; 6s. net). The most important of them all is a lecture on 'The American Spirit.' It is a lecture worth careful study and likely at this time to be carefully studied. Mrs. Griffiths has written a brief biography. It is enough to whet one's appetite for the addresses which follow, and not one of the addresses will disappoint expectation.

*The Poetry of Lucretius* was the subject of a lecture which Professor C. H. Herford delivered at the John Rylands Library, and which he has now published (Longmans; 1s. net). Dr. Herford widens the definition of poetry to include Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*. He accepts Wordsworth's dictum that poetry is not in its subject but in the impassioned handling of it. He takes 'impassioned



sioned\* to mean the response to need, and as he believes that Lucretius found something in Nature that responded to spiritual needs of his own, he counts him among the poets. Others say that the *De Rerum Natura* is simply science (the science of that day) run into verse. But what could Lucretius find in Nature that answered to needs of his own? Two things: the sense of *continuity* underlying the changing show of the material world, and the sense of *infinity*.

Professor A. S. Peake lectured at the John Rylands Library on *The Quintessence of Paulinism* (Longmans; 1s. net). The lecture makes an enjoyable book. Most of the matters of present concern are discussed in it. Dr. Peake does not follow the multitude to attribute all that is distinctive in Paulinism to the Greeks. For example, it is the custom to identify the 'flesh' with the body and find in Paul the Greek contrast between matter and spirit. Dr. Peake finds that Paul distinguished the 'flesh' from the body. Again, he holds that Paul had an adequate knowledge of the facts of Christ's life and of His teaching. As to what Paul knew *before his conversion* this is the sum: 'He passionately held fast the Law as God's appointed way of righteousness, but was conscious of inability on his own part to attain his ideal. For himself personally righteousness had not come through the Law. On the other hand he held Jesus to be a blasphemous pretender to Messiahship, cursed by the Law and therefore by God, but with misgivings whether after all He might not be the true Messiah; in which case His death was intended as an atonement for sin and to create that righteousness before God, which in Paul's own experience at least the Law had been unable to do. In which case again the Law was abolished, and Jew and Gentile were placed on the same level before God.'

In the end of a pamphlet, called *Congregationalism Re-examined* (Memorial Hall; 6d. net), in which the distinctive principle of Congregationalism, its Ministry, and other matters are competently set forth, the Rev. B. Nightingale, M.A., Litt.D., asks whether Congregationalism is worth preserving. A quarter of a century ago, he says, such a question would have been regarded as superfluous or even impertinent; a dozen years ago such a question would have been much less superfluous;

whilst to-day it needs to be asked with the utmost possible seriousness. For great men and leaders in Congregationalism like Dr. Horton and Dr. Forsyth have been saying disconcerting things and nobody seems disconcerted. Yet Dr. Nightingale advances 'solid' reasons why Congregationalism cannot disappear from the religious agencies of to-day without irreparable loss to both the Nation and the Church; and when I use the word "Congregationalism" I mean the real, strong, effective thing, and not the attenuated shadow which is sometimes substituted for it.'

The Rev. A. W. Greenup, D.D., Principal of St. John's Hall, Highbury, has translated from the Hebrew *The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi on The Book of Psalms* (Palestine House, Hackney). At least he has translated the first eight psalms, and no doubt the rest will follow. Let us choose the first comment on the first verse of the first psalm as an illustration.

'O the happiness of the man! The word for happiness is always in the plural: and the reason is that they cannot pronounce anyone happy on account of one good thing found in him or one piece of prosperity which attaches itself to him; but for many good things found in him do they say "Happineses are his!" In this psalm David includes the whole religion of man, and what he ought to do in this world and the goodly recompense of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked. And it is a very precious psalm; wherefore he begins his book with it.'

There must be many to whom a short enough and reliable enough book on the Second Advent will be welcome in these days. Just such a book has the Rev. W. J. L. Sheppard written. Its title is *The Lord's Coming and the World's End* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net). We commend it heartily and unreservedly.

We are all Christians. The Germans are Christians. They who sink hospital ships, they are all Christians. Canon Vernon Storr does not believe it. He tells *What it Means to be a Christian* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net), and it means much more than that; it means something other than that.

First, it means Christ, a personal recognition of the living Christ as the most powerful moral force in one's own life. After that it means the fact of

the Holy Spirit, the Fatherhood of God, the sense of sin, the recovery, and the responsible joy of fellowship. It is all told faithfully in seven strong sermons.

The Rev. John Blacket must be one of the most voluminous authors in Australia. He has a list of volumes after his name which runs to ten lines of the title-page, and the last line is a double etcetera. His latest book is the study of *The Manifestation of Antichrist* in this war (Elliot Stock; 1s. 6d. net). There is also an appendix on the sounding of the Last Trumpet.

The Stratford Company of Publishers in Boston, U.S.A., have undertaken the issue of a 'Universal Library.' The first three volumes are *Nine Humorous Tales*, by Anton Chekhov; *Stories of the Steppe*, by Maxim Gorki; and *What Men Live By, and Other Stories*, by Leo Tolstoi (25 cents each).

It is always advisable for the preacher to read sermons and to read widely. Let the American preacher read British sermons, and the British preacher American. That gives its own value to a volume of sermons which comes to this country all the way from Oklahoma. The volume has merits of its own. The preacher, the Rev. P. C. Schilling, D.D., makes reality his first aim, and interest his second. But the mere fact that he handles subjects which are rarely handled in a British pulpit is enough to make it worth our while to read the book.

Which of us has heard or preached a sermon on the Millennium? In *Christ Triumphant and Christian Ideal* (Boston: Stratford Co.; \$1.50 net), Dr. Schilling has a notable sermon on the Millennium. We shall be content to quote one paragraph of it.

'The shadow was miraculously turned back fifteen degrees in the dial of Ahaz, to confirm Hezekiah in the promise that God made to restore him to health and add to his life fifteen years. Therefore it is clear to my mind, that the seventh year or millennial period, as indicated by the sabbath day and sabbatical year of Israel, is to be

the last stage of existence for the material universe, —the *last day*, of all visible things, and when it has reached its limit, after its introduction (and none but God can know when that will come), the world will pass away, and nature will cease to exist. Then we cannot know when the Millennium will come, because we cannot ascertain when Jesus will return to the world. Both events are sealed mysteries of God. And it is enough for us to know that both are future, and that we should be true to Christ in all of our ways, and faithful in the discharge of all duties and obligations to our fellow-mortals. Jesus is coming again to "rule the nations with a rod of iron," but to establish the Kingdom of God in triumph and joy and great glory in the world. The subjects of that Kingdom, during His personal reign in the world, will be glorified and immortalized men and women, who have been redeemed from among the peoples of every race under the sun. Blessed consummation of this weary and sorrowful world! Let us give it welcome, and hail its approach, and wait its coming, more than they that watch for the morning. We weep over the wrecks of the world and lament its heart-rending tragedies; our hearts melt with fervent sympathy for broken-hearted parents whose children are swept from their fellowship and the bosom of the domestic paradise by an holocaust of sin; our tears of bitterness fall on the irresponsive faces of our beloved dead, over suffering infancy and the unconscious clay of sweet innocents, over the untimely births that have never seen the light, or have just looked upon it and shut their eyes for a season, waiting for the glorious light of the resurrection morning. Our souls desire to see the King in His beauty. The voice of the Church calls for Jesus to return, and all creatures long to be renewed.

These eyes shall see them fall,  
Mountains and stars and skies;  
These eyes shall see them all  
Out of their ashes rise;  
These lips His praises shall rehearse  
Whose nod restores the universe.'



# The Re-discovery of the Psalms.

BY THE REV. A. R. HOWELL, M.A., KINCARDINE-IN-MENTEITH.

## II.

### What they tell us.

THE road or street we have to walk along, perhaps every day of the year, becomes so familiar to us that we cease to observe its points of interest. But one day we have an experience that opens our eyes. We go forth under the stress of a great emotion, some overpowering joy or sorrow, and features that under ordinary circumstances we pass by unnoticed suddenly and, as we recall later, startlingly impress us. The Book of Psalms may be compared to an old and familiar road. It has been trodden by the feet of the saints, and we, less worthy, have followed in the worn and hallowed tracks. But familiar habit has often blinded our eyes to the beauties of the way, and we have passed them by unheeded. It is not so to-day. Our minds are obsessed by one absorbing topic which, while it has caused much of what has ordinarily interested us to be blotted out, has given us a new vision of some great outstanding truths.

## I.

### THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD.

A very prominent idea in the Psalms which the war has invested with tremendous significance is that of THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD. 'The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice.' 'The Lord reigneth, let the people tremble.' God's providence is manifest in nature. 'The heavens declare the glory of God,' and the 'earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof.' His sovereignty is manifest in history. All events are ordered by Him, and He is supreme over all. The 46th Psalm, along with the 47th and the 48th, may be taken as representative of a large class in proclaiming this idea. 'God is our refuge and our strength.' 'He is king over all the earth.' 'He will be our guide even unto death.' Hence God's enemies, the enemies of God's people, will be scattered. There is never any doubt in the Psalmist's mind as to the triumph of right. God is on the side of right, and on the side of those that obey Him. He is their 'Sun and Shield,' and always 'at their right hand.' Nor is His merely local or temporary triumph. All

nations must acknowledge Jehovah. None can stand against Him, and one day His will shall prevail over all for ever. In the moments of despondency to which one is sometimes tempted when, to our weak faith, God seems indifferent, and His presence and power and willingness to help are too feebly realized by us, the unfaltering optimism of the Psalms is a bracing tonic. 'O bless our God, ye people. Which holdeth our soul in life, and suffereth not our feet to be moved.' Even in the so-called Imprecatory Psalms, where we find a vindictive hatred of the enemies of Israel that we feel to be directly contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, it is the sovereignty of God that is the underlying thought. We recall the rude and violent character of the age in which these utterances were spoken, and we can eliminate their barbaric and unchristian spirit. We see that what they really stand for is a passionate and uncompromising zeal for God and for God's righteousness, and a correspondingly measureless hatred of wrong and oppression. During the Indian Mutiny the 79th Psalm was felt to be an almost literal interpretation of the appalled and outraged public sentiment of the time. There is much in the mere language of the Imprecatory Psalms that we feel it is impossible to use to-day. But we can appreciate still the white heat of indignation and loathing when we recoil with horror from the 'frightfulness' of a ruthless and unscrupulous enemy. 'Fill their faces with shame that they may seek Thy name, O Lord, that men may know that Thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth.'

## II.

### THE SENSE OF THE CROSS.

The Psalms are appealing very strongly to us just now because they have so manifestly THE SENSE OF THE CROSS. Many have told us recently that in France and Flanders where the fighting has been severe, and even the churches have been reduced to ruins, the image of the Cross

has invariably remained intact, standing solitary and arresting amidst the surrounding desolation. The fact is wonderfully suggestive of the place which the Cross holds in the eye of the world to-day. In the untold suffering of thousands of stricken hearts, and in the magnificent self-sacrifice of our soldiers, we have learnt anew that

All through life we see a Cross,  
Where sons of God yield up their breath;  
There is no gain except by loss,  
There is no life except through death.

And we are realizing, in consequence, a new fulness and richness of meaning in the Cross of Jesus, as not merely the unique event it is in history, but as the supreme example of the great law of the higher life. Of course, we do not find this idea consciously present in the Psalms in the fuller light in which we now see it. There is a hint of it, perhaps, in the classic expression of the law of sacrifice in the 40th Psalm, quoted by the writer to the Hebrews as realized in 'the offering of the body of Jesus Christ.' Our Lord, too, when He hung upon the Cross, repeated the opening words of the 22nd Psalm as if to claim the fulfilment in Himself of the idea of the 'righteous' sufferer. But the distinctive note in the Psalms in this connexion—and it is this that is giving them their present appeal—is *the continual record of suffering in them side by side with a continuous and unfaltering faith and hope*. These writers were great sufferers, sometimes, as we gather, because of their own sins or because of national sins, for they believed strongly in the close connexion between sin and suffering. But most frequently their sufferings were those of 'the righteous.' Though they had sinned, their fault was surely as nothing in comparison with that of the heathen who were oppressing them (Ps 59<sup>3-4</sup>). It was a real problem, and it is the way in which it was met that is so helpful to us. The suffering of the righteous is accepted in the spirit of sacrifice, the very spirit of the Cross. Following close upon the bitter cry of perplexity and anguish come the indomitable and triumphant expressions of unshaken faith in God. 'Be of good courage and He shall strengthen your heart, all ye that hope in the Lord.'

### III.

#### THE CONDITIONS OF TRUE PEACE.

As we read the Psalms to-day we seem to find a new emphasis upon what they tell us of THE

CONDITIONS OF TRUE PEACE. Times of calamity are times of heart-searching. 'Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts; and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting.' We feel we have a clear conscience in regard to the initiation of the great war. Yet as a people and as individuals do we not need chastening and cleansing? Are there not crying evils amongst us that we have tolerated too long? Have there not been disquieting symptoms in our national life even during the course of the war that may well lead us to ask, Are we worth fighting for? Do we deserve to win? Are we able, when the time comes, to bring in the 'new world' which we hope is to 'redress the balance of the old'? Amidst this wholesome chastening of spirit the great Penitential Psalms and other similar utterances throughout the Psalter bring us a message that is always needed. 'Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? . . . He that hath clean hands and a pure heart.' 'Delight thyself in the Lord, and He shall give thee the desires of thine heart.' 'The meek shall inherit the earth, and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace.' In the 106th Psalm the sacred writer reviews the long history of his people, and finds the source of all their troubles of the past in forgetfulness of God and in rebellion against His law. In the 1st Psalm, on the contrary, as if to strike a note that shall vibrate through the whole book, we are given the secret of a happy and prosperous life. 'Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly . . . but his delight is in the law of the Lord. . . . For the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous, but the way of the ungodly shall perish.' The war, with all that it is teaching us, is making such words ring true in our hearts with an insistence that will not be put by. Every competent observer of the times is telling us that we stand at the parting of the ways as to what henceforth shall be the ideals which shall shape and control the destinies of the future. It will be well with us and with those who come after us to the extent that we follow this teaching of the Psalms. A humble penitence, an utter dependence upon God, a simple obedience to Him and to His law of righteousness are the imperative conditions of a true and lasting peace.



## Christianity in History.

BY THE REV. ROBERT MACKINTOSH, M.A., D.D., PROFESSOR OF ETHICS, CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY,  
AND APOLOGETICS IN LANCASHIRE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE, MANCHESTER.

EVEN in a season distinguished by an unusually interesting output of theological works, the volume issued by Dr. Bartlet and Dr. Carlyle<sup>1</sup> may be held to stand highest of all. Theirs is an interesting and long-established partnership, between a liberal-minded Nonconformist and a liberal-minded Churchman; but never before have the two friends collaborated on so important a scale or with such striking success. While each of the authors is an expert on a special period, neither of them is a specialist in the bad sense. They have many-sided interests. And in this volume they have worked through the whole material in consultation with each other—a fact which adds not a little to the value of their book.

To put Christianity into six hundred pages is no small task for the best equipped and most capable of minds. By approaching the subject historically—not in the way of constructing an imaginary or (at the best) an arbitrary Essence of Christianity—the authors have made their task easier in kind but more burdensome in quantity. The history they offer us is not confined to doctrine. Doctrine has its place in the book, and is permanently of value; yet it is only the skeleton or the scaffolding of the Christian life. Nor does the narrative lose itself in external events. It essays a middle path, trying to put on record how the Christian spirit and life has manifested itself, individually and socially, age by age. When we consider the difficulty and vast importance of such an enterprise, the narrative may be said to move with surprising ease. As far as possible, the reader is spared. Quotations from any foreign language, with scarcely an exception, are given in English translation. Historical assertions are hardly at all argued out—space forbade that. The well-informed reader, up to the limits of his own knowledge, will be able to divine the grounds for the assertions made; the unlearned reader can assure himself that he is given, on each point,

conclusions which have commended themselves to two very able and well-furnished minds, who know the evidence in full, and who have dismissed as less probable other views on the points in question. One thing the authors have been able to do for their readers. They quote original materials, not very often, but tellingly. Sometimes these are familiar passages, more often unfamiliar, always first-hand matter wisely chosen; e.g. early sacramental liturgies, showing the religious mind of the age in its truest because most devotional attitude.

Part I., 'The Beginnings,' deals with the N.T. While the presence of an eschatological strain in the thought of the Master is admitted, it is urged that other and deeper elements must have been central on His own intention. 1 Peter is regarded as the most typical of N.T. Epistles, free from the more startling peculiarities found in the great mind of St. Paul. In St. Paul's own case, it is urged that he *cannot* have been as much of a sacramentalist as some would make him to-day. He has laid down eternal spiritual principles which forbid sacramental extravagances. His own sacramental language must be viewed as symbolic.

Part II. is the most elaborate of all. The preface dwells upon this fact, not by way of apology, but rather to explain why it must be so. The growth of the system conveniently known as Catholicism is traced almost inch by inch on the three lines of sacraments, doctrines, orders. It is pointed out that all three are in correlation, and that all are tinged with local and temporary influences from the non-Christian environment. Catholic sacramentalism has something of a pagan quality. Nicene doctrine has something of that sacramentalism at its heart.

The Middle Ages (Part III.) are treated with a freer movement of generalization and in less detail. Indeed, the Part is rather an essay than a history proper; though doctrinal growths are duly noted, and the crowning sacramental exaggerations described with a touch almost of indignation. In spite of admitted mediæval emphasis upon authority, we are reminded that the Middle Ages steadily appealed to 'custom,' and beyond it to

<sup>1</sup> *Christianity in History: A Study of Religious Development.* By J. Vernon Bartlet, M.A., D.D., and A. J. Carlyle, M.A., D.Litt. 12s. net. (Macmillan & Co. Ltd., London, 1917.)

Divine or Natural Law, as a safeguard against arbitrariness. Almost paradoxically we are told that the period subserved the growth of individuality, if only because of its plea for Church autonomy in face of the State. Such a thesis enables the authors to trace continuity, and to divine even in the 'dark' ages the promise and potency of the modern world.

The authors draw special attention to their treatment of the Reformation (in Part IV.), not in abstract separation from its past and future, nor yet as the first of modern phases, but—along with kindred minor movements—as part of 'the Great Transition.' Continuity, once again! We are made to feel how tremendous an event was the Protestant breach with Rome, and, if inevitable, yet in some ways how regrettable.

In Part V., 'The Modern World,' the treatment gains not alone in interest, but—if one may trust one's impressions—in penetration and mastery. Recent Christianity is studied against the background of the world of free modern culture, especially scientific, but also æsthetic and poetical. The characterization of Coleridge's poetry is extraordinarily telling; so is the exhibition of the significance of Faust's turning to magic because weary of dry logic. A spirited apology is offered for Romanticism, as a return to beauty, to sympathy with the Middle Ages, to the spirit of a wider corporate life. Kant, Schleiermacher, Hegel, Ritschl are touched off briefly but in most suggestive fashion.

The leading positive clue which the authors put forward in the name of a Christian philosophy is a worthy analysis of personality. This is to safeguard what is moral and what is evangelical in Christian faith and life. For lack of such a philosophy, early Christology could only be half-successful, and early sacramentalism was held in no sufficient check. But the foundations are now (one gathers) in good measure laid. Personality in man, by a profound intuition, grasps and responds to the personality of God (Augustine, Abelard, the early Friends, Jacobi, Coleridge,—after Kant and Hegel, but more wisely,—F. D. Maurice). Christ is the supreme influence developing the personality of His redeemed. What Christology this will yield cannot of course fully appear in such a treatise as the present History, though there are suggestive hints. One

ought also to mention repeated protests, in the interests of moral personality, against exaggerated 'Absolutism' and against reckless appeals to omnipotence.

More generally, and writing as historians, the authors—as their title-page already declares—work with the clue of Development. A subtle thought! Sometimes it emphasizes what changes may establish themselves by slow degrees. P. 192, in view of the final form of sacramentalism in the ancient Church, ejaculates: 'Such changes can development bring about!' But more frequently the other side is stressed, as on p. 590: 'the master-idea, giving unity and continuity amid all diversity, is Development.' Another effect: if everything has its place in the development, no phase can claim to be more than a single humble part of the many-sided truth. To historians, everything is 'relative.' Doctrine is relative—not this doctrine or that, merely, but doctrine as such. At its best it is secondary. The life of godliness is primary. Catholicism or High-Church sacramentalism, the leading form (as regards time and as regards space) of organized Christianity, is shown up and discredited when its origins are impartially recorded. But what about Christ Himself? Very delicately and reverently, in Part I., we are warned that the Master's teaching as first apprehended—nay, more than that, even as first delivered—contained certain inadequate and temporary elements. This problem of the distinctiveness of central Christianity recurs, perhaps with added difficulty, towards the end of the book. Once again we find ourselves within sight of matters suggested, but not fully discussed, in the present volume.

Possibly, in the long run, it is not the historian, with his 'relative' view of all things, who can speak the last word regarding Christ and Christianity. Yet historical treatment is a wholesome correction for all the dogmatisms—one's own, as well as those of others. And the History before us is full of good things. A short notice can hardly display even specimens of the riches of Eshcol. There is as much of the evangelical temper in this volume as there is of learning and of liberality. Every competent reader who works through it will find that he has appreciably advanced his own theological and religious education.



## Contributions and Comments.

### A Note on Luke xx. 39.

I do not know if the verbal similarity of this to LXX version of Ps 21<sup>80</sup> [He 22<sup>80</sup>], καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μου αὐτῷ ζῇ, has been noted. If these are our Lord's words, and not a gloss, as is supposed by Bruce (*Expositor's New Test.* i. 616), may it not be supposed that He concluded the argument by an authoritative quotation from O.T. as in other cases: e.g. Have ye not read what David did? It is, of course, the Ps. which begins: 'Ἠλέ, Ἠλέ λαμὰ σαβαχθανί (LXX: 'Ο θεός, ὁ θεός μου, πρόσχες μοι, ἵνατί ἐγκατέλιπές με;), from which the words on the Cross were quoted in Hebrew. If it is a quotation, or a reminiscence, did our Lord quote from Hebrew or the LXX?

Our A.V. and R.V. are opposed to LXX, and there is no reference in the margin. The translation is 'none can keep alive his own soul.' But it is more than probable that the LXX represents the true Hebrew text. The Targum supports it. The difference between  $\text{אֵין}$  = not, and  $\text{אֵין}$  = unto him, is slight, and the source, of confusion elsewhere in O.T.; yet, as there were no points, the distinction between 'he doth not preserve his soul alive' and 'And my soul liveth unto him' is involved in it. May it not be held that our Lord quoted from the original Hebrew, and that Luke gives the reference from LXX, and that there was no suspicion or doubt then that the text meant anything but 'my soul liveth unto him.' It may also be noted that St. Paul's  $\text{ὁ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ}$ , (Ro 6<sup>10. 11</sup>) seems also to be an echo of LXX.

The outcome would be that Bruce is wrong in regarding the words as 'an editorial explanatory gloss to make the deep thought of our Lord clearer'; i.e. in  $\text{θεὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔστι νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων}$ . They would be quite in our Lord's manner of reference to O.T.

Also it would not, I think, be so easy to give v.<sup>29</sup> in the Ps. the national rather than the personal significance with Briggs (vol. i. *Psalms*, Int. Crit. Com.).

W. J. FERRAR.

East Finchley Vicarage.

### Gamaliel.

THE Hellenistic Seminar of the University of Manchester has been investigating the Gamaliel passage of Ac 5<sup>34-41</sup>. He is there called νομοδιδάσκαλος. What we know of Gamaliel agrees with this description. Like his grandfather Hillel, he originated many legal ordinances. As President of the assembly of judges he is known to have dictated three letters to the secretary, Johannan, two of which had reference to tithes, and the third gave notice of an intercalary month upon which Gamaliel and his colleagues had decided. He is also said to have ordered the removal from the Temple precincts of a Targum on the Book of Job, the oldest written Targum of which anything is known. Some Christian writers have thrown doubts upon Gamaliel's having been President of the Council. Upon what grounds they do this is not very clear.

We have no record that at his time the head of the Sanhedrin, who was also head of the Tribunal, was a teacher in any stricter sense than that implied above. Gamaliel enjoyed the highest reputation as an authority in the interpretation of Scripture and in deciding questions affecting the application of the Law. The school of Hillel, whose head he undoubtedly was, always appears collectively in its controversies with the school of Shammai. Individual scholars and their opinions are not mentioned. Gamaliel is omitted in the chain of tradition given in the Mishna (Abot i. 11). Johannan ben Zackai is named as the one who continued the tradition after Hillel and Shammai. St. Luke does not say that St. Paul 'sat' at the feet of Gamaliel, but that he was 'brought up' (or educated) 'beside' his feet.

Texts, versions, and commentators are divided in opinion as to the punctuation of Ac 22<sup>3</sup>. There are weighty authorities in favour of placing the comma after τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ. There are equally weighty authorities for inserting it after Γαμαλιήλ. It is argued that because the first two clauses begin with a perfect participle, the third must be made to begin likewise. This method cannot be applied to the fourth clause, which must commence ἐηλωτῆς ὑπάρχων.

The rhythm of the sentence has been used as an argument for determining the grouping of the words. An examination of the structure shows that it consists of four groups, going in pairs. The first two have the participle at the beginning of each clause and three stress-beats in each of them. In the second pair the participles follow part of the clause and there are six stress-beats in each. Παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιήλ, therefore, does not belong to the second clause of the first pair, but to the first clause of the second pair. Unless the verse is thus punctuated the entire structure is vitiated. The syllables with the stress may be underlined thus: γεγενημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας, ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιήλ πεπαιδευμένος κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν τοῦ πατρῷου νόμου, ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τοῦ Θεοῦ, καθὼς πάντες ὑμεῖς ἐστέ σήμερον.

The problem, now, is to determine the meaning of παρὰ τοὺς πόδας. Robertson instances Mt 13<sup>1</sup> 20<sup>30</sup>, Mk 4<sup>1</sup>, Lk 5<sup>1</sup>, Ac 10<sup>6</sup> 22<sup>3</sup>; as examples of παρὰ with the accusative after verbs of rest. (*Grammar of the Greek of the New Testament*, 1914, p. 615. It may be presumed that here Robertson's ἀνατεθραμμένους, 'men who had been brought up,' is a misprint and not a variant reading.) Jerome appears not to have been certain how to interpret these passages. He uses 'ad' in Mk 4<sup>1</sup>, 'juxta' in Ac 10<sup>6</sup>, and 'secus' in Mt 13<sup>1</sup> 4, Lk 5<sup>1</sup>, Ac 22<sup>3</sup>. The Peshitto has ܡܝܬܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ here. The oldest known

Arabic versions follow closely the translation of the Peshitto. The Bohairic reads, 'Nourished at the feet of Gamaliel, he who taught me accurately the law of our fathers.' The Paris Polyglot (reprinted in the Newcastle Edition of the Bible in Arabic, 1811), though valueless for textual purposes, in one word offers an interesting interpretation of παρὰ τοὺς πόδας. 'Reared in this city in the presence of (أدى = French 'chez') a man named

Gamaliel instructed in what concerns the freedom (or writings) of the law of the fathers.' The passage may be taken to infer that St. Paul's parents died when he was young, and that he was reared as one of the family in the home of Rabban Gamaliel.

St. Luke says that St. Paul spoke in Hebrew (Aramaic). Probably, then, the original of παρὰ

τοὺς πόδας was ܠܪܝܠ (Dt 33<sup>3</sup>). In 1 S 25<sup>42</sup>, Job 18<sup>11</sup>, and Hab 3<sup>5</sup>, it has the meaning 'behind,' 'at the heels of.' In Gn 30<sup>30</sup> and Is 41<sup>2</sup>, it means 'following step by step.' In Aramaic ܠܪܝܠ may be rendered 'following,' 'according to,' 'in the wake of,' 'in the school of thought of,' and ܣܠܝܠ has the signification 'in vestigiis ejus.'

In describing his education (*Life*, ii.) Josephus uses favourite words of St. Paul and St. Luke, παιδεύω, προκόπτω, διαφέρω, ἀκριβέστερον. He does not appear to have studied with any one teacher. 'I made mighty proficiency in my learning, and appeared to have both a great memory and understanding. Moreover, when I was a child of about fourteen years of age, I was commended by all for the love I had to learning; on which account the high priests and principal men of the city came then frequently to me together, in order to know the accurate understanding of points of the law.'

The great-great-grandson of Gamaliel, Rabbi Jehudah the Holy (A.D. 135-220) is represented as sitting on the ground while his elders sat on benches, asking them questions, and starting objections, which the other Rabbis examined (Baba Metzia, f. 84 b; vol. xii. pp. 216, 217, in Rodkinson's translation). This, however, would be some sixty years after the establishment of the Rabbinical schools at Jamnia.

This concludes our survey of the evidence. The Seminar would like, therefore, to submit for the criticism of your readers the following paraphrase of the opening argument of St. Paul's speech: 'Do not forget that I am a Jew. It is true that I was born in Tarsus in Cilicia, but I grew up in this city. Here I was brought under the influence of Gamaliel. According to his school of exegesis I was instructed in our ancestral Law. I was always as zealous in my devotion to it as all of you are to-day.' G. CORRIE GLANVILLE.

Greenheys, Manchester.

## The Future of the Revised Version.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES raises again the always interesting speculation as to whether the R.V. will gradually displace the A.V. Fifty years is suggested as the time of transition; approximately corre-



sponding to the remaining years of the generation whose education was completed before the R.V. appeared. May I venture to suggest, and illustrate, precisely the opposite tendency?

I was eight years old when the Revised N.T. appeared, and twelve when the O.T. followed it. I was at once introduced to the R.V. at home. At school and at Cambridge I was brought up almost entirely on it. To me when I was ordained the R.V. was the familiar version. For some years after my ordination I persisted in my preference for the R.V., but with gradually weakening strength. I don't mind saying now that I wholly prefer the A.V.

So far as the O.T. goes I think there can be no doubt that the R.V. is better. But the importance of the N.T. is paramount: and there I think on balance the A.V. has the advantage. Partly it is a matter of translation. For example, the Revisers' treatment of Aorists, Perfects, and Imperfects is sometimes a real improvement. But more often it is a mere schoolmasterly trick (to find out whether a boy has construed his lesson or not) and weakens the translation. And the rule of 'a word for a word,'—again schoolmasterly rather than scholarly—has impoverished the English without improving the Greek. But mainly, I think, it is a question of Text.

On the Revisers' Committee were two world-famous scholars who had devoted their lives to Textual Criticism, Dr. Scrivener and Dr. Hort. Dr. Hort won the day; and so doing I fear he lost all the ages to come. The slavery to two famous manuscripts, one recently discovered under romantic circumstances, the other specially interesting from the jealous care with which it was guarded, is not the strength but the weakness of the R.V. In the end it will be its undoing.

Of course the discussion of isolated readings will often show the R.V. right and the A.V. wrong. But the whole principle of the R.V. in virtually accepting Dr. Hort's unhistorical theory of the 'Syrian' revision was mistaken. So too are many of the rules of evidence on which it is based.

'*Proclivi scriptione praestat ardua*' may sometimes help us to determine a knotty question; but to make it the general rule of excellence is like living on mustard, salt, pepper, and rejecting sugar and fruit and cream. To give him his due, Dr. Hort had the full courage of his convictions; and not only preferred the 'difficult' to the 'easy,' but also (logically and consistently) the 'impossible' to the 'difficult.'

And has not the critical treatment of the Synoptic question undermined (or effectively spiked) another canon of criticism? Where two Gospels were found to agree in some MSS. and differ in others, we were taught to prefer the reading that gave a difference, and to accuse some unknown scribe of wilful or accidental assimilation. But if, as we now believe, the Gospels had a common origin (whether written or oral) the probability is reversed. *Caeteris paribus* we should prefer the identical reading as original, and regard the variant as a mistake.

The Doxology to the Lord's Prayer in Mt 6<sup>14</sup> was omitted by the Revisers on what then seemed overwhelming evidence. But since the R.V. appeared we have the *Didache*, certainly older than  $\aleph B$  and perhaps older than the Greek of St. Matthew, and the *Didache* restores the Doxology. I hardly dare even to refer to the mutilated prayer given by the R.V. at Lk 11<sup>2-4</sup>.

Yet even in the case of the Lord's Prayer our indebtedness to the R.V. is real and lasting. The doctrine of a personal devil ('Deliver us from the Evil One') is too important to be obscured.

You say that 'they who use the A.V. in youth will cleave to it in manhood.' There must be many now, like myself, in middle life, who have been brought up on the R.V. I value and respect the R.V. still. But I am a convert to the use of the A.V. The R.V. is the long-standing acquaintance. But the A.V. has become the dearer friend.

D. R. FOTHERINGHAM.

Charing Vicarage.

## Entre Nous.

### The Modern Mother.

Lady Glenconner has wonderful children, and Lady Glenconner's children have a wonderful mother. Before the age of nine one of the children wrote this poem—it is given in facsimile in *The Sayings of the Children* (Blackwell; 6s.

net), the spelling and the penmanship suggesting six as the probable age:

I know a face, a lovely face,  
As full of beauty as of grace,  
A face of pleasure, ever bright,  
In utter darkness it gives light.

A face that is itself like Joy,  
To have seen it I'm a lucky boy,  
But I've a joy that have few other,  
This lovely woman is my MOTHER.

The children are numbered, not named. This is how Lady Glenconner trained them. The particular child was 'Four,' of whom a perfectly bewitching photograph is given on the page opposite that on which this story begins:

One day he made his Mother very sad by killing one of his gold-fish. He made no secret of it, he deliberately fished it out, and laid it on the boards beside the bowl that had contained it. Then he carefully set one blue rosetted shoe upon it, and stamped. He was four years old at the time, and his Mother knows that the act had less of cruelty in it than interest. It was in the nature of an experiment, an excursion into the realm of power. None the less it was an event that overwhelmed his Mother. She knew not how to meet it, whether to punish or explain, nor in which way to do either. That her concern was felt by him was certain, for he crimsoned when he saw her distress. This showed he was not callous. He heard her murmur to herself, 'What ought I to do? What can I do? I don't think a whipping would be the right thing.' He listened with interest, and then said with feeling: 'A good thing if I was shut up in a dark room without my dinner or tea.'

'Would you be willing to bear that?'

'Yes.'

She had been right in feeling that whipping would be of less than no use for a child of his character. It would have hardened, and not enlightened, him; for when she mentioned it, murmuring to herself in her first perplexity of distress, he had looked defiance. 'I'll tell everyone in the house, I killed the fish—I'll tell everyone in the world, I killed the fish.' Yet his Mother could not decide if it were right to let him formulate his own punishment. Some visitors arrived at this moment so that she had to defer the matter. 'You must go out now, Four,' she said, 'and I must think the matter over, before I can say what I shall ask you to bear for having killed the fish. You have told me you will suffer something?'

'Yes,' he said, and turning a brigand's glance upon the visitors, he left the room.

It was the custom of the children's Father to sit by them at bedtime, and tell them stories, so on this evening the Mother told him what had happened and suggested his telling the story of St. Francis of Assisi, and the manner of his taming the birds and fishes by his gentleness. Four listened with pondering eye. 'Was he a real man?'

Late that night Four's Mother heard him stir in his sleep.

'Are you sorry?'

'Yes.'

'Did you know it would die if you took it out of the water?'

'Yes.'

'Did you want it to die?'

'Yes.'

'Why?'

'I only wanted one.'

'But you could have given one away. If it were alive again would you kill it?'

'Leave it alive.'

'What will you do about it?'

'Go without pudding for two or three days.'

'For two days, or three days?'

'For three days.'

'Very well.'

'I'll go without pudding or dates; but I may have a banana, mayn't I?'

'Well, what do you yourself think?'

'Not a banana.'

Next day at lunch, pudding was not asked for, and dates were not asked for, but just as they were all leaving the luncheon table, a little hand was thrust out and a banana taken. 'I'm not going to eat it *now*,' he said—and he dropped it into his pinafore. 'What did you say last night?' 'But I'm not going to eat it *now*.' His Mother stretched out her hand, but he got quickly down from his high chair and ran to the door. His Mother was not going to follow hastily. There was to be no pursuit and unseemly scuffle; the banana must be relinquished, but it would have to be of his own free will, or all that had passed would be worse than useless. After a few minutes his Mother went to the door, she saw the small square figure of four years old, half-way up the staircase, standing watching for her. His Mother said, 'Four, if you break your promise now, you break my heart.' Silently he came downstairs towards her, put the banana in her hands, and slowly walked upstairs



again. Dignity is native to his nature, and has been shown from earliest years; that is why it would have been ill-judged to coerce him. The character of punishment should always be in the nature of expiation, which is from within: and not of retaliation, which is from without. His Mother knew he was of that character that can only be taught by being led to feel, and think, morally.

'Where are you going, Four?'

They were walking slowly upstairs all this while; he being still of an age that sets both feet on each step, one after the other, in true nursery fashion. He answered her question by pointing one tiny finger to the night nursery door. When his Mother went in some time later, she found him sitting on the ground with his hands clasping his knees, thinking.

#### Was it Luck or was it God?

Captain Ball, V.C., several times wrote as if he felt that there was a Divine influence watching over him, protecting him when he was flying. Once in a postscript to a letter home: 'Your remark in your letter about God looking after me is quite right, for I think it is God and not only luck.' The airman poet, Paul Bewsher, has written of a similar belief in the 'Dawn Patrol':

Then do I feel with God quite, quite alone,  
High in the virgin morn, so white and still,  
And free from human ill:  
My prayers transcend my feeble earth-bound  
    plaints—  
As though I sang among the happy Saints  
With many a holy thrill—  
As though the glowing sun were God's bright  
    Throne.

My flight is done. I cross the line of foam  
That breaks about a town of grey and red,  
Whose streets and squares lie dead  
Beneath the silent dawn—then am I proud  
That England's peace to guard I am allowed—  
Then bow my humble head,  
In thanks to Him Who brings me safely home.

#### Singing and Ascending.

In the poem just quoted Bewsher speaks of 'Singing among the happy Saints, with many a holy thrill.' The impulse to sing as they ascend

seems to be frequently felt by airmen. Captain Ball spoke of it, and in another poem Bewsher writes of the

... joy that on these flashing wings  
I cleave the skies—O! let them fret—  
Now know I why the skylark sings  
Untrammelled in the boundless air—  
For mine it is his bliss to share.

#### The Bloom of the Plum.

I certainly never did or will read impure things in books or newspapers. I consider familiarity with impurity rubs the bloom off the plum, which never can be restored. Minds differ, some almost enjoy to read queer things. Impurity does not seem to me to find any response in you: you can come in contact and it runs off like quicksilver—leaves no print. I don't think that is common.<sup>1</sup>

#### This Philistine.

How are you getting on? Any rare anecdotes? Or is it to be a sort of literary choke-damp? Come up here on the Thursday and read over your lecture, and I'll give you lessons in gesture, voice modulation, the art of bowing, the secret of how to speak in a happy tone when half of the people have walked out and the other half are sound asleep. At any rate, come on the Thursday, and I'll take you to a nice home, the heads of which you may judge of by the following anecdote. —, good-natured honest soul, has a pretty house and a loving wife. Before she was married she got a letter from him—a very important one, such as you perhaps have written more than once! She turned up her text-book to see what the verse for the day was. And it was:—'The Lord that delivered me out of the paw of the lion, and out of the paw of the bear, He will deliver me out of the hand of this Philistine!' They both enjoy that story, and so does every one who knows them. So come.<sup>2</sup>

#### The Briton and the Hun.

Since the war began every one has been finding in his reading illustrations and coincidences. One of the most curious we have come upon is in Whittier. He has a poem in commemoration of

<sup>1</sup> *The Life of Sophia Jex-Blake*, 113.

<sup>2</sup> *Life and Letters of John Paterson Struthers, M.A.*, 121.

Elizabeth Fry (written in 1885). He compares her with Elizabeth of Hungary, or Thuringia as he prefers to say. The poem ends with this verse :

United now, the Briton and the Hun,  
Each, in her own time, faithful unto death,  
Live sister souls! in name and spirit one,  
Thuringia's saint and our Elizabeth!<sup>1</sup>

#### Progress.

There are in life two elements, one transitory and progressive, the other comparatively if not absolutely non-progressive and eternal, and the Soul of man is chiefly concerned with the second. Try to compare our inventions, our material civilization, our stores of accumulated knowledge, with those of the age of Æschylus or Aristotle or St. Francis, and the comparison is absurd. Our superiority is beyond question and beyond measure. But compare any chosen poet of our age with Æschylus, any philosopher with Aristotle, any saintly preacher with St. Francis, and the result is totally different. I do not wish to argue that we have fallen below the standard of those past ages; but it is clear that we are not definitely above them. The things of the spirit depend on will, on effort, on aspiration, on the quality of the individual soul; and not on discoveries and material advances which can be accumulated and added up.<sup>2</sup>

#### Faith and Feeling.

Mr. Gerard Gould, in *The Helping Hand*, says: 'The act of will at any given moment is omnipotent. This is the meaning of Christ's saying that a faith no bigger than a mustard-seed can move mountains. The material mountains are not moved by the faith that they will be moved: but what do the material mountains amount to, what *are* they, after all? To you, at any given moment, the sum of reality is only what you feel it to be: if you are thwarted by the material, you can transcend whatever thwarts you by *feeling* that it has no power to thwart you: if you cannot make the mountains move, you can *feel as if* they were moved: and that, to you, is the reality. If man could perpetuate, against the pressure of material conditions, that act of will (which is one

with the act of faith, and one with the act of creation), the material world would cease to count, and the omnipotence of divinity would be attained.'

What is that? Is it Christian Science? Whatever it is, it is not Christianity. It is not religion of any kind. Faith is not an act of the human will; it is the opening for God's power to enter into the life, and the act is God's, not ours. Faith is a venture, but it is a venture upon God, not upon our own feelings.

#### What say they?

Early specialisation is a wasteful mistake. It is instruction in a hurry. All specialisation, if it is to be fruitful, requires a certain amount of real education to enable the mind to take advantage of it. Let me illustrate. When technical schools were set up in Germany the thing was done with the national thoroughness, and the youths were shot out into their specialised studies at a very early age. But it was soon found that there had not been bred in them enough general intelligence to take advantage of the special facilities; so several steps had to be retraced, and the period of general education prolonged. By the time the Germans had discovered this, however, we had become alarmed at their industrial superiority, and we had begun to imitate them and their initial mistake. We set up technical schools too. But we have had to make the same discovery and the same retreat. Let us realise that it takes a good deal of general culture to make a proper and fertile use of technical facilities, and that premature specialisation defeats its own end, like feeding infants on lobster and pickles.<sup>3</sup>

We all know what the weak have suffered from the strong; but who shall compute what the strong have suffered from the weak? 'The last shall be first'; but when they become first they become also the worst tyrants—impalpable, anonymous and petty.<sup>4</sup>

This is certain, that God is Love. How, else, could He have created the Universe?<sup>5</sup>

It is easier, looked at fairly, to have faith than to fear.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Whittier's *Poetical Works*, i. 413.

<sup>2</sup> Gilbert Murray in *Religio Grammatici*.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. P. T. Forsyth in *Problems of To-morrow*.

<sup>4</sup> Edward Moore in *We Moderns*.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> A. Wilson-Carmichael in *Ponnammal*.



The love of Browning comes all in a night's time. It came to me in a sudden.<sup>1</sup>

Boaz and Ruth became the ancestors of Christ, not because they were geniuses, but simple, God-fearing people, who did common everyday work as well as they could.<sup>1</sup>

There's no hope of Scotland being cured of its drunkenness as long as even we teetotallers can tell funny stories about it.<sup>1</sup>

One of my rules, and perhaps the most valuable (I have tried to observe it throughout my career), was to be in Court five minutes before the Judge took his seat.<sup>2</sup>

Love is a better thing than mere sinlessness: it is the strong, active, positive principle of fellowship and redemption and construction: to share with the suffering and the shamed is better than to be ignorant of shame and suffering. We have to look on sin, like everything else, as a fellowship. Our own sin is, so to speak, part of the common stock.<sup>3</sup>

Everybody, probably, has moments of sheer physical exaltation, when by some happy mystery of health, mood and circumstance, he feels capable of conquering all difficulties, and realises with suddenness and vividness that *things are to him precisely what he chooses to regard them as being*.<sup>4</sup>

The future and the character of a League of Nations will vary with the attitude of the Christian commonwealth. Some development in political machinery, in the shape of a League of Nations, is bound to follow the War. Conditions of food supply alone will in all probability force upon us some measure of international co-operation. Whether that co-operation is to be inspired with a grudging spirit or a spirit of goodwill, whether the League of Nations is to be but a disguise for the old selfish diplomacy or the beginning of a new era, will depend largely on the extent to which the Churches bring the Christian spirit into international relations.<sup>5</sup>

R. C. Lehmann.

It does not do for a journal to let all its best things be published separately. We have steadily resisted the desire, and the old volumes of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES retain their value. But it would have been a loss to literature if we had had to hunt for Mr. Lehmann's poems in back numbers of *Punch*. And of course *Punch* has good things in plenty left.

How memorable the poems are! You remember the Singing Water? And the Contract between Peggy aged six and her father?

'So, Daddy, please remember this, because—I—want—you—to:—

I'll never marry any boy; I'll only marry *you*.'

And the mad rush of Duke and Soo-Ti?

Down, Duke, down! Enough, enough!  
Soo-Ti's screaming; seize his scruff.

Soo-Ti's having fearful fits;  
Duke is tearing us to bits.

One will trip us, one will throw us—  
But, the darlings, *don't* they know us!

Then off with a clatter the long dog leapt, and,  
oh, what a race he ran,

At the hurricane pace of a minute a mile, as  
only a long dog can.

Into and out of the bushes he pierced like a  
shooting star;

And now he thundered around us, and now he  
was whirling far.

And the little dog gazed till he seemed amazed,  
and then he took to it too;

With shrill notes flung from his pert pink tongue  
right after his friend he flew;

And the long legs lashed and the short legs  
flashed and scurried like anything,

While Duke ran round in a circle and Soo-Ti  
ran in a ring.

The title of the volume is *The Vagabond* (Lane;  
3s. 6d. net).

Theodore Maynard.

There is an unusual mixture of the secular and the sacred in Mr. Theodore Maynard's volume entitled *Folly, and Other Poems* (Macdonald; 5s. net). It is not that the two are undifferentiated. Being a Roman Catholic, Mr. Maynard dis-

<sup>1</sup> J. P. Struthers in *Life and Letters of John Paterson Struthers, M.A.*, 151, 195, 273.

<sup>2</sup> Sir Edward Clarke in *The Story of my Life*.

<sup>3</sup> Gerald Gould in *The Helping Hand*. <sup>4</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>5</sup> Professor H. G. Wood in *Problems of To-morrow*.



tinguishes them sharply. But they seem to be both needed to make up his world, an earnest appreciation of Cloistered Love side by side with a wild irresponsible Drinking Song. There is no doubt of the poetic ability. The most passionate of the poems are those that tell of the joy of faith in God. Take for example

MERCY.

Now am I armoured against hell  
And all its terrors;  
Hate hideous and hurtful fell  
As foolish errors

In that strange hour when Mercy spoke  
And skies were riven:  
A voice like rolling thunder broke,  
'Thou art forgiven!'

What dread so deep as this dismay  
Can ever shake me?  
What vengeance of the Judgment Day  
Can overtake me.

Who touched the hidden core of fear  
Death keeps no guard on;  
Who trembling heard—and lived to hear—  
God's awful pardon?

P. H. B. Lyon.

Lieutenant Lyon's *Songs of Youth and War* (Macdonald; 2s. 6d. net) are half of them songs of youth and half of them songs of war, and the difference is very remarkable. It is the difference between youth and manhood. It is the difference the war has made. In the 'Songs of Youth' he is ambitious:

Spirit of Liberty, my Soul inspire!  
Strike with immortal fire the songs I bring,  
The firstlings of my heart, each lovely thing,  
Sorrow and courage, laughter and desire!

So when my bones are white upon the pyre  
Still on the lips of strangers shall I sing,  
While lovers in the summer lingering  
Whisper the melodies of my dead lyre.

If the war had not caught him, however, the ambition might never have been realized. But read this:

DECISION.

'We need a man of steady hand and brain,  
A man who does not hold his life too dear;  
For failure means no chance to fail again'—  
He paused:—'Is that man here?'

And one that heard threw back a weary head,  
And stayed a moment lost in memories;—  
A red rose pillowed on a cheek as red,—  
Old, straying melodies,—

A roaring London street,—a young boy's face  
Upturning, flushed with laughter;—and the  
chime  
Of country church bells in a quiet place,  
At home, at Christmas time;—

Strange, long-forgotten things. And then he  
heard  
A voice from the next dug-out rise and fall  
On a whispered song: the candle flared, and  
stirred  
The shadows on the wall.

A soaring star-shell burst in silver light,  
A shot wailed through the blackness overhead,  
The Spirit of God came to him in the night—  
'Here am I; send me,' he said.

Sacheverell Sitwell.

We have seen some of Sacheverell Sitwell's poetry before. It was his own. This is his own also. The title is *The People's Palace* (Blackwell; 2s. 6d. net). Nature is the inspirer, and the inspiration is not as Wordsworth felt it or any other. Take

THE MOON.

The white nightingale is hidden in the branches  
And heavy leafage of the clouds.  
She pours down her song—  
Cascades threaded like pearls,  
And the winds, her many-noted flutes  
Flood forth their harmony—  
But the Earth turns away  
Swinging in its air and water-rocked cradle.

Alec Waugh.

The war has found no interpreter in Mr. Alec Waugh. He calls the book *Resentment Poems* (Grant Richards; 3s. 6d. net). For he has no patience with 'comfortable words':



Sermons about 'Life's little span,'  
And 'the lasting joys of the heavenly place.'

The silence round a dying man,  
The terror in his face.

Sometimes the reality as he sees it is flashed  
out in words that are scarcely quotable, unre-  
lieved bitterness, unrestrained loathing. And why?  
There is no hope of a hereafter. There is no  
sense of a God that knows only

The crucible of the irresistible might  
That drives the wheels of being day and night.

Yet how moving is this of

#### THE ATTACK AT DAWN.

With tired questioning eyes that gaze and gaze,  
Searching for something they cannot under-  
stand;

I wait for the dawn to creep through the  
shrinking haze

Across the twisted lines and the shell-ploughed  
land

And the narrow plot that is mine to the end of  
days.

There I shall take the restless brain that now  
Surges with discontent and doubts and fears;  
And watch it cease. Perhaps it is better so.

The way grows darker with the lengthening  
years.

There are so many things that we shall never  
know.

But there will sleep too my heart's treasures;—  
All that I ever dreamed of fair and good,  
Child visions that might have grown to some-  
thing wise,

An untold love, that secret growth that would  
Have burst into blossoms of flame beneath her  
eyes.

And all of it lost: spattered about war's ways:  
Torn, bleeding flesh: I do not understand.

And soon the dawn will creep through the  
shrinking haze

Across the 'twisted lines and the shell-  
ploughed land

And end the watching of these eyes that gaze  
and gaze. . . .

#### Herbert Trench.

Two fine volumes, with the title *Poems*, contain  
Mr. Herbert Trench's 'Poetical Works,' together  
with his 'Fables in Prose' (Constable; 10s. 6d.  
net). Four narrative poems occupy 130 pages at  
the beginning of the first volume. The longest  
and strongest is 'Deirdre Wedded.' But the  
Queen of Gothland and Apollo and the Seaman  
are also known and admired. The fourth, 'The  
Rock of Cloud,' is new.

The shorter poems which follow are likely to  
be most popular. They are nearly all new or  
newly collected into volume form. Certainly Mr.  
Trench will never be a favourite with the unre-  
flecting newspaper reader. But some of these  
shorter poems are simple enough to increase the  
number of his admirers, and they are poetical  
enough to increase his reputation. The war is  
the inspiration of many of them, and they must  
be reckoned among the poems of the war that  
will live. Read the one on the 'Advance on the  
Somme':

Wild airman, you, the battle's eyes,  
Who, hovering over forest air,  
Can every belt of cloud despise  
And through them fall without despair,  
No cannon's sound to you can rise  
But say how goes the battle there  
As they advance!

Be dumb, choked heart! for they are dumb—  
Our men advancing. All's at stake!  
The woods are bullet-stript—with hum  
Of cannon all the pastures shake;  
And some will cross the crest, and some  
Will halt for ever in the brake  
As they advance.

The ground is bubbling—pit and mire—  
And blackened with the blood of sons.  
Death rains on every yard; and fire  
Shuttles the veil with woof of guns.  
Holy the flag those wearers dire  
Shall make to shroud our gallant ones  
As they advance!

They follow now—who rode so well—  
A braver hunt than e'er blew horn:  
Through many a warren'd wood of hell  
They'll follow, till the fateful morn.



And them the mud-stain'd sentinel  
Shall watch, and see an age newborn  
As they advance!

Henry Burton.

If the poet is born not made, more so the hymn-writer. In *Killed in Action, and Other War Poems* (Kelly; 7d. net), there is at least one hymn which the makers of hymnals must take in:

#### BREAK, DAY OF GOD.

Break, day of God, O break,  
Sweet light of heavenly skies!  
I all for thee forsake,  
And from my dead self rise;  
O Lamb of God, whose love is light,  
Shine on my soul, and all is bright.

Break, day of God, O break!  
The night has lingered long;  
Our hearts with sighing wake,  
We weep for sin and wrong;  
O Bright and Morning Star, draw near;  
O Sun of Righteousness, appear!

Break, day of God, O break!  
The earth with strife is worn;  
The hills with thunder shake,  
Hearts of the people mourn;  
Break, day of God, sweet day of peace,  
And bid the shout of warriors cease!

Break, day of God, O break,  
Like to the days above!  
Let purity awake,  
And faith, and hope, and love;  
But lo! we see the brightening sky;  
The golden morn is drawing nigh.

Gilbert Thomas.

There are only ten poems in the new volume *Towards the Dawn* (Headley; 1s. 3d. net), by Mr. Gilbert Thomas, but every one is true and strong. Is not this, taken for its shortness, sufficient evidence?

#### SPRING IN WAR TIME.

I thought that God, perchance, in punishment  
Of the world's sin, would stay His gifts this year  
And that no Spring in glory would appear;—

Even *His* mercy must, it seemed, be spent!  
Yet, on this blue May morning, as I went  
Along the rustling lanes, the birds made cheer  
Such as before had never charmed my ear;  
And had the woods e'er breathed a richer scent?

So sweet it was, I fled! I could not face  
The scourge of God's forgiveness! *I could bear,*  
*Amid the world's red guilt and black despair,*  
*Thy wrath, I cried, but not Thy mercy, Lord!*  
*Oh, spare me from the year's unfolding grace,*  
*For every flower is as a two-edged sword!*

Stella Benson.

A striking feature of two striking novels, *I Pose* and *This is the End*, is the poetry—song or reverie—that is scattered through them. Twenty poems, chiefly from those two books, have now been republished in one volume, and the title is *Twenty* (Macmillan; 3s. 6d. net). Miss Stella Benson is certainly a clever artist, but by no means so obscure as many of our present-day clever artists are. In this address 'To the Unborn,' there is a keen edge of truth which the world is somewhat likely to feel at present and to profit by:

#### TO THE UNBORN.

Oh, bend your eyes, nor send your glance about.  
Oh, watch your feet, nor stray beyond the kerb.  
Oh, bind your heart lest it find secrets out.  
For thus no punishment  
Of magic shall disturb  
Your very great content.

Oh, shut your lips to words that are forbidden.  
Oh, throw away your sword, nor think to fight.  
Seek not the best, the best is better hidden.  
Thus need you have no fear,  
No terrible delight  
Shall cross your path, my dear.

Call no man foe, but never love a stranger.  
Build up no plan, nor any star pursue.  
Go forth with crowds; in loneliness is danger.  
Thus nothing God can send,  
And nothing God can do  
Shall pierce your peace, my friend.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,  
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,  
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.